

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

EDITORS:

HENRY B. SMITH AND J. M. SHERWOOD.

Associate Editors:

ALBERT BARNES, Philadelphia.

ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

JONATHAN B. CONDIT, Auburn Theological Seminary, N. Y.

JANUARY 1867.

NEW YORK:

WILLIAM SHERWOOD, No. 651 BROADWAY.

(At the Book Store of CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co.)

PHILADELPHIA:

PRESBYTERIAN BOOKSTORE, 1334 CHESTNUT STREET.

BOSTON: A. WILLIAMS & CO.

HOURS AT HOME

For 1867.

In addition to the usual features of the Magazine, we announce as special attractions for the year:

1. A series of articles in successive numbers, by Rev. HORACE BUSHNELL, D.D., on "The Moral Uses of the Dark Things of the World."
2. A series on Representative Cities: Damascus, Tyre, Athens, Jerusalem, Rome, Constantinople, etc. By Professor W. S. TYLER, of Amherst College.
3. A serial, running through the year, by the author of "Geoffrey the Lollard," entitled "Marcella of Rome," a story of extraordinary interest, descriptive of the trials, sufferings, and heroic endurance of Christians in the first ages of the Church, as illustrated in the experience of a Roman maiden who united the culture of the schools and the philosophies of the age to the simple faith and sublime life of the Cross.
4. Another serial, which will run through the year, by one of our best female writers, entitled "Storm-Cliff," a story of American life, full of incident, and strikingly illustrative of the counter-influences which beset one in life.
5. Mr. MITCHELL ("Ik Marvel") will resume and complete the series of papers on "Rural Life."
6. Those fresh and lively sketches, entitled "Rambles among the Italian Hills," by an American lady resident at Rome, will be continued.
7. Contributions also on various topics, by Dr. HOLLAND, and by a large number of the best and most distinguished writers in American literature.

NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

Out of thousands of favorable notices, we select a few as samples:

We cordially commend it as a safe, interesting, and valuable magazine. Not designed to be exclusively religious, it is pervaded by a Christian spirit; and while free from the frivolities of much of the current literature of the day, it is lively and entertaining, and is well stored with articles of solid worth, from the pens of our most eminent writers. It is just such a magazine as every Christian and cultivated family would like to welcome as a monthly visitor.—*New-York Observer*.

The Magazine takes high rank for variety, interest, literary merit, and evangelical tone. We trust it is widely as well as favorably known.—*Springfield Republican*.

The moral and religious influence of HOURS AT HOME is unquestionable; its literary taste and execution have been decidedly marked. In the October number will be found the continuation of Geoffrey the Lollard, which promises to be as interesting as the Schönberg-Cotta Family.—*Hartford Post*.

A magazine which meets a real want of the community, and one which we can commend for its literary excellence and moral tone to every household in the land.—*New-York Evangelist*.

Fully on a level with its more elderly competers.—*New-York Times*.

As a family magazine it has no rival.—*Christian Intelligencer*.

As a magazine for the family or fireside, it meets a widely extended want, and can scarcely subject its readers to the possibility of a disappointment in its perusal.—*New-York Tribune*.

This magazine improves with every new issue. In literary merit it ranks with the best, while its moral and religious tone commands it strongly to the confidence of the Christian public.—*Sunday-School Times*.

If there is any magazine in the country which deserves a wide circulation in the families of the land it is this. It

is eminently a "Home" monthly. It is such an one as we like to have in our homes for young and old. It comes from and creates a pure atmosphere. Its articles, too, are from the best pens in the land, and are full of instructive matter in most attractive forms.—*Christian Witness*.

The increasing popularity of this monthly is an evidence of true merit. Each number presents new attractions, and to us seems an improvement on the previous one. For a new issue it is certainly taking a rank of which its conductors may well be proud.—*Poughkeepsie Daily Press*.

HOURS AT HOME continues to maintain its speedily acquired, but high and well-deserved reputation.—*Boston Courier*.

This popular monthly has been interesting and valuable from the very first. It seems to us, however, that it is becoming more so every succeeding number. Its articles are written in truly chaste and classic style, and present a very pleasing variety. The best talent in the land is employed on this work.—*German Reformed Messenger*.

Its character for literary ability is steadily rising, and the rich variety of its contents, as announced, must excite the curiosity of every reader. We regard the success of this journal as among the encouraging signs of the time, and we cordially recommend it to the patronage of our friends.—*Presbyterian*.

The aim of this new monthly is to furnish the best Family Magazine in the country, free from every taint of impurity, inculcating a Christian morality, and infusing an evangelical religious spirit into our literature, while, at the same time, possessing the highest literary merit. And in this they have, in the judgment of the public, decidedly succeeded. We are glad to learn that its patronage has steadily increased from the day of its first issue till now, and never so rapidly as for the last month or two. So we are that our friends who are desirous of an American monthly of a high literary and moral character, cannot do better than "try HOURS AT HOME." In this we quite agree with our neighbor, the *Independent*.—*Elect Magazine*.

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.,

654 Broadway, New-York

(See next page.)

the

moral

people,

untitled

and

of a

simple

untitled

unter-

Life."

erican

est and

ti

n one as

It comes

, too, are

structive

ness.

evidence

ions, and

e. For

its con-

Press.

eedily ac-

—Boston

t valuable

at it is be-

s articles

d present

ne land

messenger

ising, and

must excite

success of

the times

age of our

best Fam-

plaint of

nfusing a

e, while,

nerit. An

c, decided

ronage be

ie till not

two. Sur

n America

r, cannot

is we qu

t.—Ecl

0.,

ew-Yor

[illegible]

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

NEW SERIES. NO. XVII.--JANUARY, 1867.

ART. 1.—EXTEMPORANEOUS PREACHING.

BY WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D. D., Prof. in Union Theological Seminary

THE discussion of the subject of Homiletics would be incomplete, if it did not include the topic of Extemporaneous Preaching.

This species of sacred eloquence has always existed in the church, and some of the best periods in the history of Christianity have been characterized by its wide prevalence and high excellence. The Apostolic age, the missionary periods in Patristic and Mediæval history, the age of the Reformation, the revival of evangelical religion in the English Church in the eighteenth century, in connection with the preaching of Wesley and Whitfield, and the "Great Awakening" in this country, were marked by the free utterance of the extemporaneous preacher. Being now too much neglected by the clergy of those denominations which both furnish and require the highest professional education,—a clergy, therefore, who have the best right to employ this species of sermonizing,—here is reason for directing attention to it. In discuss-

ing this subject, we shall first speak of the *nature* of extemporaneous preaching, and then of some of the requisites in order to its successful *practice*.

I. The term "extemporaneous" as commonly employed denotes something hurried, off-hand, and superficial, and general usage associates imperfection and inefficiency with this adjective. There is nothing, however, in the etymology of the word which necessarily requires that such a signification be put upon it. Extemporaneous preaching is preaching *ex tempore*, from the time. This may mean either of two things, according to the sense in which the word *tempus* is taken. It may denote that the sermon is the hasty and careless product of that one particular *instant* of time in which the person speaks; the rambling and prolix effort of that *punctum* temporis which is an infinitely small point, and which can produce only an infinitely small result. This is the meaning too commonly assigned to the word in question, and hence inferiority in all intellectual respects is too commonly associated with it, both in theory and in practice. For it is indisputable that the human mind will work very inefficiently if it works by the minute merely, and originates its products under the spur and impulse of the single instant alone.

But the phrase "extemporaneous preaching" may and should mean, preaching from *all* the time, past as well as present. Behind every extemporaneous sermon, as really as behind every written sermon, the whole duration of the preacher's life, with all the culture and learning it has brought with it, should lie. The genuine extemporaneous discourse, as really as the most carefully written discourse, should be the result of a sum-total,—the exponent of the whole past life, the whole past discipline, the whole past study and reflection of the man. Sir Joshua Reynolds was once asked by a person for whom he had painted a small cabinet picture, how he could demand so much for a work which had employed him only five days. He replied: "Five days! why, sir, I have expended the work of thirty-five years upon it." This was the truth.

Behind that little picture there lay the studies, the practice, and the toil of a great genius for more than three decades of years in the painter's studio. It is not the mere immediate effort that must be considered in estimating the nature and value of an intellectual product, but that far more important preparatory effort that went before it, and cost a life time of toil. The painter's reply holds good in respect to every properly constructed extemporaneous oration. It is not the product of the mere instant of time in which it is uttered, but involves, *equally with the written oration*, the whole life and entire culture of the orator.

Taking this view of the nature of extemporaneous preaching, it is plain that there is not such a heaven-wide difference between it and written preaching, as is often supposed. There is no *material* difference between the two. The extemporaneous sermon must be constructed upon the same general principles of rhetoric and homiletics with the written sermon, and must be the embodiment and result of the same literary, scientific and professional culture. The difference between the two species of discourses is merely *formal*. And even this statement is too strong. There is not even a strictly formal difference, for the very same style and diction, the very same *technically* formal properties, are required in the one as in the other. The difference does not respect the form as distinguished from the matter of eloquence, but merely the form of the form. In extemporaneous preaching, the form is oral, while in the other species it is written. There is, therefore, not only no material difference between the two, but there is not even a rigorously and strictly formal difference. Both are the results of the same study, the same reflection, the same experience. The same *man* is the author of both, and both alike will exhibit his learning or his ignorance, his mental power or his mental feebleness, his spirituality and his unspirituality. An ignorant, undisciplined and unspiritual man cannot write a good sermon; neither *need* a learned, thoroughly disciplined

and holy man preach a bad extemporaneous sermon. For nothing but the want of *practice* would prevent a learned mind, a methodical mind, a holy mind, from doing itself justice and credit in extemporaneous oratory.

A moment's consideration of the nature and operations of the human mind, of its powers by nature and its attainments by study, is sufficient to show that the difference between written and unwritten discourse is merely formal, and less than strictly formal; is secondary, and highly secondary. The mind of man is full of living powers of various sorts, capable of an awakened and vigorous action which expresses and embodies itself in literary products, such as the essay, the oration, the poem. But is there anything in the nature of these powers which renders it necessary that they should manifest themselves in one, and only one, way? Is there anything in the constitution of the human mind that compels it to exhibit the issues of its subtle and mysterious agency uniformly, and in every instance, by means of the pen? Is there anything in the intrinsic nature of mental discipline which forbids its utterance, its clear, full and powerful utterance, by means of *spoken* words? Must the contents of the heart and intellect be, of necessity, discharged only by means of the written symbol of thought? Certainly not. If there only be a mind well disciplined, and well stored with the materials of discourse, the chief thing is secured. The manner, whether written or oral, in which it shall deliver itself, is a secondary matter, and can readily be secured by practice. If the habit of delivering thought without pen in hand were taken up *as early in life* by the educated clergy, and were as *uniform* and *fixed* as is the habit of delivering it with pen in hand, it would be just as easy a habit. If it be supposed that unwritten discourse is incompatible with accuracy and finish, the history of literature disproves it. Some of the most elaborate literary productions were orally delivered. The blind Homer extemporized the Iliad and Odyssey. Milton, in his blindness, dictated to his daughter the

Paradise Lost. Walter Scott often employed an amanuensis when weary of composing with the pen in hand. Cæsar, it is said, was able to keep several amanuenses busy, each upon a distinct subject; thus carrying on several processes of composition without any aid from chirography. The private secretary of Webster remarks of him: "The amount of business which he sometimes transacted during a single morning may be guessed at, when it is mentioned that he not unfrequently kept two persons employed writing at his dictation at the same time; for, as he usually walked the floor on such occasions, he would give his chief clerk a sentence in one room to be incorporated in a diplomatic paper, and marching to the room occupied by his private secretary give him the skeleton or perhaps the very language of a private letter."* A writer in the *Quarterly Review* remarks that "it was in the open air that Wordsworth found the materials for his poems, and it was in the open air, according to the poet himself, that nine-tenths of them were shaped. A stranger asked permission of the servant at Rydal to see the study. 'This,' said she, as she showed the room, 'is my master's library, where he keeps his books, but his study is out of doors.' The poor neighbors, on catching the sound of his humming in the act of verse making, after some prolonged absence from home, were wont to exclaim 'There he is, we are glad to hear him *booing* about again.' From the time of his settlement at Grasmere he had a physical infirmity which prevented his composing pen in hand. Before he had been five minutes at his desk, his chest became oppressed, and a perspiration started out over his whole body; to which was added, in subsequent years, incessant liability to inflammation in his eyes. Thus when he had inwardly digested as many lines as his memory could carry, he usually had recourse to some of the inmates of his house to commit them to paper."†

There is, therefore, nothing in the *nature* of extemporaneous

* LANMAN: *Private Life of Webster*, p. 84.

† LONDON *QUARTERLY REVIEW*: Vol. XCII, p. 212.

preaching incompatible with thoroughness of insight, clearness of presentation, or power of expression. Whether an unwritten sermon shall be profound, lucid, and impressive, or not, depends upon the preacher. If, after the due amount of immediate labor upon it, it fails to possess the qualities of good discourse, it is because the author himself lacks either earning, discipline, or practice, and not because there is anything in the nature of the production in question to preclude depth, clearness, and effectiveness.

The truth of these remarks will be still more apparent, if we bear in mind that the extemporaneous sermon has not had the due amount of work expended upon it. It has too often been resorted to in idle and indolent moods, instead of being the object upon which the diligent and studious preacher has expended the best of his powers, and the choicest of his time. Again, the extemporaneous sermon has not been the product of persevering practice, and of the skill that comes from persevering practice. The preacher, in the tremor of his opening ministry, makes two or three attempts to preach extempore, and then desists. Remembering the defects of these first attempts, and comparing them with the more finished discourses which he has been in the *habit* and *practice* of writing, he draws the hasty and unfounded inference, that from the nature of the case oral discourse must be inferior to written discourse. But who can doubt that with an equal amount of practice, of patient persistent practice, this species of sermon might be made equal to the other in those solid qualities in which, it must be confessed, it is too generally inferior? Who can doubt that if the clergy would form the habit, and acquire the self-possession and skill of the lawyer, in respect to unwritten discourse, and then would expend the same amount of labor upon the unwritten that they do upon the written sermon, it would be as profound, as logical, as finished, and more effective? The fact is, that there is nothing in the oral, any more than in the written method of delivering thought, that is fitted to hamper the operations of the

human mind. If an educated man has truth and eloquence within him, it needs nothing but *constant practice* to bring it out in either form he pleases, in written or extemporaneous language. Habit and practice will, in either case, impart both ability and facility. Take away the skill which is acquired by the habitual practice of composing with the pen in hand, and it would be as difficult for one to deliver his thoughts in writing, as it is for one who has acquired no skill, by the practice of extemporaneous discourse, to deliver his thoughts orally. Nay, how often when the thoughts flow thick and fast is the slow pen found to impede the process of composition. In such a case, the mind yearns to give itself vent in unwritten language, and would do so, if it had only acquired the confidence before an audience, and the skill which are the result not of mere nature, but of habit and practice.

II. The truth of these assertions respecting the intrinsic nature of extemporaneous preaching will be still more evident by considering the chief requisites in order to the attainment of the gift. It will be found, that provided these exist, the unwritten sermon affords an opportunity for the display of all those substantial qualities which are commonly supposed to belong to written sermons alone, and, in addition, of all those qualities which co-exist only with the burning words and free delivery of the orator untrammelled by a manuscript and the effort to read it.

1. The first requisite in order to extemporaneous preaching is *a heart glowing and beating with evangelical affections*. The heart is the seat of life, the source of vigor, the spring of power. From this centre, vitality, energy and impulse go out and pervade the whole system. To the heart, whether in physiology or psychology, we must look for the central force. If profound feeling, the feeling that is grounded in reason and truth, pervade discourse, it will surely attain the end of eloquence, and produce deep movement in the hearer. That peculiar energy, issuing from the heart, which we designate by

the word emotion, must mix and mingle with the energy issuing from the intellect, in order to the highest power of speech. It was because, as Macaulay says, "his reason was penetrated and made red-hot by his passion," that Fox was one of the most effective and overwhelming of orators. And the same truth will be evident, if, instead of looking at the discourse itself we contemplate the action of the discourses's mind. In order that the human faculties may work with the greatest energy and harmony, the heart must be in the head and the head in the heart. Never does the mind operate so powerfully, and with such truth and beauty of result, as when the faculty of cognition co-works with the faculty of feeling. If these two faculties become one and indivisible in action, the result is not merely truth, but *living* truth; truth fused and glowing with all the feeling of the heart, and feeling mingled with and made substantial by all the truth of the head. The light is heat, and the heat is light.

These remarks respecting the function and agency of the heart are true in every province, but especially in that of religion. The inmost essence of religion itself has been placed by Schleiermacher, one of the profoundest of the German theologians, solely in feeling. It is probably an error to make either knowledge or feeling, *by itself and apart from the other*, the ultimate essence of religion. Religion is neither knowledge in isolation, nor feeling in isolation, but a most original and intimate synthesis of both. If either element by itself be regarded as the sole and single constituent, theology becomes either rationalistic and speculative, or else mystical and vague. And yet, even those theologians whose scientific spirit has led them to emphasize creeds, and made them shy of sentimental religion, have always acknowledged that the heart is not only the seat of piety, but one important source of theological science itself.

If this is true in reference to the theologian, it is still more so in reference to the preacher. He needs the strong stir and impulse of holy affections, in order to succeed in his vocation ;

and especially when he has not the written discourse upon which to rely. A heart replete and swelling with the grand emotions of christianity is a well of water springing up into everlasting life and power, for it is fed from infinite fountains. With what force, vividness, and natural method also, does the Christian, destitute it may be of mental discipline and culture, sometimes speak upon the subject of religion out of a full heart. What wonderful insight does he oftentimes display into the very depths of religion and theology, thus proving the truth of the saying, "the heart sees further than the head." Or, to take another instance, with what power and fresh originality does the convicted sinner utter himself upon the doctrine of human guilt, when he is full of the awful feeling itself. Given a heart filled with intelligent rational feeling respecting any subject, and the primal power by which effective discourse upon it is to be originated is given also.

Now, so far as this first requisite in order to the practice of extemporaneous preaching is concerned, it can most certainly be secured by every preacher. Nay, he is presumed to possess it, as that which in a great degree justifies him in entering the ministry. Let him by prayer and meditation first purify the feeling of his heart and then render it more deep and intense by the same means, and he will be prepared to speak freely and forcibly to the human heart. Let him take heed that his feeling be *spiritual*, an affection in distinction from a passion,* the product of God's word and spirit, and not the mere excitement of the sensibilities, and he will preach with the demonstration of the spirit and with power, as did Paul "without notes," though it may be in weakness and in fear, and in much trembling, and not with enticing words.

2. In the second place, a *methodising intellect* is requisite in order to successful extemporaneous preaching. By a *methodising intellect* is meant, one which *spontaneously* works in a logi-

* See the account of this important distinction, by THEREMIN : Rhetoric, p. 131, sq.

cal manner, and to which consecutive reasoning has become *natural*. All truth is logical. It is logically connected and related, and that mind is methodical which detects this relation and connection as it were, by instinct. This natural logic, this spontaneous method, is one great source of mental power. How readily do we listen to one who unfolds truth with a facile and effortless precision, and how easily does his discourse win its way into us.

We have said that truth is logical in its essential nature. But is equally true that the human mind is logical in its essential nature. For the truth and the mind are correlatives. One is set over against the other. The truth is the object to be known, and the mind is the subject or agent to know it; and subject and object are antitheses like hunger and food, like thirst and water. Consequently, in its idea, or in other words, by its creation, the human intellect is as logical in its structure as the truth is in its nature. By its constitution, the mind is designed to be methodical and consecutive in its working, and to apprehend logical truth logically.

Now, by reason of discipline and practice the human intellect works towards this true end of its creation, and acquires an instinctive ability to think methodically, and to unfold consecutively any subject presented to it. The exhibition of truth by a methodizing intellect is *exhaustive* (to use a term of Macintosh), and the whole truth is thus unfolded, in its substance, its connections and relations. This methodizing talent *developes* a subject, unrolling it to the centre and showing the whole of it. Kant has a chapter upon the architectonic nature of the pure reason,—by which he means that innate system of laws which reason follows in building up architecturally its conclusions,—and shows that when these laws are followed, a logical whole is as certainly and *naturally* produced, as is the honeycomb with its hexagonal cells, when the bee follows the architectonic laws of instinct.* Now, a methodizing mind is one

* Kant : Kritik der reinen Vernunft, p. 641 sq. (Die Architectonik der reinen Vernunft.)

which by discipline and practice has reached that degree of philosophic culture in which these systematizing laws work *spontaneously*, by *their own exceeding lawfulness*, and instinctively develop in a systematic and consecutive manner the whole truth of a subject. The results of the operation of such a mind may well be called architecture; for they are built up according to eternal law, in order and beauty. There is no grander fabric, no fairer architectural structure than a rational, logical system of truth. It is fairer and more majestic than St. Peter's. A great system of thought rises like that cathedral with a

"Vastness which grows; but grows to harmonize,
All musical in its immensities."

In speaking of the heart as the seat of feeling, we had occasion to allude to its influence in modifying the operations of the mind considered as a whole. It was seen that it imparts vitality to the total mental action, and infuses vigor through all the products of this action. A methodizing intellect exerts a very important influence in the same reference. Feeling, though vivific and energizing, is not precise and clear in its own nature. The man of all feeling has a vague and mystic tendency. Hence the need of logic, in order that the energy issuing from the head may be prevented from diffusing itself over too wide a surface, and may be guided into channels and flow along in them. When a beating heart is allied with a methodizing mind, there is at once vigor and life with clearness and precision. The warm emotions are kept from exhaling and becoming vapory and obscure, by the systematizing tendency of the logical faculty, and the hard, dry forms of logic are softened and enlivened by the vernal breath of the emotions.

It is evident, that if the sacred orator possesses such a discipline of head and heart as has been described, it will be easy for him to apply it to any theme he chooses, and to speak upon it in any manner he may elect. The human mind when highly train-

ed can labor with success in almost every direction. Education is, in truth, not a dead mass of accumulations, but the power to work with the brain. If this power be acquired, it is a matter of secondary consequence, what be the special topic upon which the work is expended, or the particular manner, oral or written, in which the result is embodied. In the ancient gymnasium, the first purpose was to produce a muscular man, an athlete. When this was accomplished, it mattered little whether he entered the lists of the wrestler, or of the boxer, or of the racer. Nay, if he were thorough-bred, he might attempt the *pancratium* itself, and carry off all the laurels. Assuming the existence of such a salient heart, and such a methodical head, nothing but habitual practice is needed to permit their employment before any audience whatsoever, and without the aid of a manuscript. If the preacher has attained this facility of methodizing, and is under the impulse of ebullient, swelling affections, awakened by the clear vision of divine truths and realities, he will be able to speak powerfully, in any presence and *extempore*. The furnace is full, and the moulds are ready. Nothing is needed but to draw off; and when this is done, a solid and symmetrical product is the result.

3. A third requisite in order to the practice of extemporaneous preaching is the *power of amplification*.* By this is meant, the ability to dwell upon an important point or principle, until the hearer shall feel the whole force of it. It is the tendency of a thoughtful, and especially of a methodizing mind, to be satisfied with the great leading principles of a theme, and not to tarry long upon any one idea, however capital it may be. Such a mind is able to pass over a subject with great rapidity, by touching only the prominent parts of it, as the fabled Titans stepped from mountain to mountain, without going up and down the intervening vallies. But the common hearer, the popular audience, cannot follow, and hence the methodical and full mind must learn to enlarge and illustrate, until the prin-

* Compare the author's DISCOURSES AND ESSAYS, p. 96.

ciple is perceived in all its length and breadth, and the idea is contemplated in all its height and depth. Just in proportion as the methodizing mind acquires this amplifying talent, does it become oratorical ; without it, though there may be philosophy, there cannot be eloquence.

But this talent will be speedily acquired by careful pains and practice in regard to it. The speaker needs merely to stop his mind in its onward logical movement, and let its energy head back upon the idea or the principle which his feeling and his logic have brought out to view. Indeed, the tendency, after a little practice, will be to dwell too long, to amplify too much, when once the mind has directed its whole power to a single topic. As matter of fact, the preacher will find, altogether contrary to his expectations, that his oral discourse is more expanded and diffuse than his written, that his extemporaneous sermon is longer than his manuscript. An undue amplification is the principal fault in the eloquence of Burke, who was one of the most methodical and full minds in literary history. In the language of Goldsmith, he

. " went on refining,
And thought of convincing while they thought of dining."

Hence, although never unwelcome to his readers, his magnificent amplification was sometimes tedious to his hearers. Though the British House of Commons at the close of the last century was not a "fit audience" for Burke, because it had but small sympathy with that broad and high political philosophy out of which his masculine and thoughtful eloquence sprang like the British oak from the strong black mould of ages, though Burke would not be the "dinner bell" for the present British Parliament, still his excessive amplification, undoubtedly, somewhat impedes that rapid rush and Demosthenean vehemence of movement which distinguishes eloquence from all other species of discourse.

4. A fourth requisite in order to successful extemporaneous preaching is a *precise mode of expression*. A methodical mind

thinks clearly, and therefore the language should be select and exact, that it may suit the mental action. If the orator's thoughts are distinct and lucid, he needs carefully to reject any and every word that does not convey the precise meaning he would express. Indeed *rejection* is the chief work in clothing the thoughts of a highly disciplined mind. It is an error to suppose that the main difficulty in extemporaneous preaching lies in the want of words, just as it is an error to suppose that great natural fluency is an indispensable aid to it. Dr. Chalmers never acquired the ability to speak extempore in a manner at all satisfactory to himself, or to his auditors when they remembered his written discourses. And the cause of this, according to his own statement, was the unmastered and overmastering fluency of his mind. Thoughts and words came in on him like a flood. In extemporaneous utterance, they impeded each other, to use his own expression, like water attempted to be forced all at once out of a narrow-mouthed jug. A more entire mastery of his resources, a power to repress this fluency, to control the coming deluge, which might have been acquired by patient practice, would have rendered Chalmers a most wonderful extemporaneous preacher, at the same time that it would have improved his written sermons, by rendering them less plethoric and tumid in style, and more exact and precise in phraseology.

Uncontrolled fluency is equally a hindrance to excellent poetical composition. Byron speaks of the "fatal facility" of the octo-syllabic verse. It runs too easily to be favorable to the composition of thoughtful poetry. Some of Byron's own poetry, and a great deal of Scott's, betrays this fatal facility in a too abundant use of what Goldsmith humorously calls "the property of jinglimus." The melody is not subordinated to the harmony, the rythm is monotonous, and the reader sighs after a more stirring and varied music.

Natural fluency is a fatal facility in the orator also, unless he guards against it by the cultivation of strict logic, and precise phraseology. Men generally, even those who are reputed to

be men of few words, are fluent when *roused*. When the feeling are awakened, and the intellect is working intensely, there are more thoughts and words than the *unpractised* speaker can take care of. What is needed is, coolness and entire self-mastery in the midst of this animation and inspiration, so that it may not interfere with itself, and impede its own movement. What is needed is, the ability in this glow of the heart, this tempest and whirlwind of feeling, to *reject* all thoughts that do not strictly belong to the subject, and all words that do not precisely convey the cool, clear thought of the cool, clear head. The orator must be able to check his thunder in mid volley. This is really the great art in extemporaneous discourse; and it cannot be attained except by continual practice, and careful attention, with reference to it. The old and finished speaker always uses fewer and choicer words, than the young orator. The language of Webster during the last half of his public life was more select, and precise, than it was previously. He employed fewer words to convey the same amount of meaning, by growing more nice and careful in the rejection of those vague words which come thick and thronging when the mind is roused. Hence the language he did use is full of meaning; as one said, "every word weighs a pound."

We have thus discussed the principal requisites in order to successful extemporaneous preaching. It will be evident that the subject has not been placed upon a weak foundation, or that but little has been demanded of the extemporaneous preacher. A heart full of devout and spiritual affections, a spontaneously methodizing intellect, the power of amplification, and a precise phraseology are not small attainments. A great preparation has been required, on the part of him who preaches unwritten sermons; but only because it is precisely the same that is required, in order to the production of excellent written discourse. If this preparation has actually been made,—if his heart is full, and his intellect spontaneously methodical in its working; if he can dwell sufficiently long upon particular points, and can express himself with precision

—then, with no more *immediate* preparation than is required to compose the written sermon, and NO LESS, the preacher may speak as logically as he does when he writes, and even more freshly and impressively. But, as was remarked in the beginning, the extemporaneous sermon will be the product, not of the particular instant but, of all the time of the speaker's life,—of all the knowledge and culture he has acquired by the sedulous discipline of his intellect, and the diligent keeping of his heart. Whether, then, all may preach unwritten sermons depends upon whether all may acquire the requisites that have been described; and to assert that the clergy generally cannot acquire them, would be a libel upon them. There have been instances of men so thorough in their learning, and so spontaneously methodical in their mental habits, that even with little or no immediate preparation, they could speak most logically and effectually. It is related of John Howe, that, "such were his stores of thought and so thoroughly were they digested, he could preach as methodically without preparation, as others after the closest study." Robert Hall composed his singularly finished and elegant discourses, lying at full length upon chairs placed side by side, a device to relieve acute pain. It is true that these were extraordinary men, but not a little of their power arose from the simple fact that they felt strongly, thought patiently, and practised constantly.

And this brings us to the last, but by no means least important point in the discussion of this subject; and this is the patient and persevering *practice* of extemporaneous preaching. These requisites to unwritten discourse that have been mentioned may all be attained, and as matter of fact are attained in a greater or less degree by every preacher who composes written sermons, and yet there be no extemporaneous discourse. Many a preacher is conscious of possessing these capabilities, and can and does exert them through the pen, who would be overwhelmed and struck dumb if he should suddenly be deprived of his manuscript, and be compelled to

address an audience extemporaneously. These requisites must, therefore, *actually be put into requisition*. The preacher must actually speak extemporaneously, and be in the habit of so doing. And there is one single rule, and but one, the observance of which will secure that uniform practice without which the finest capacities will lie dormant, and unused. At the very opening of his ministry the preacher must begin to deliver one extemporaneous sermon on the sabbath, and do so uniformly to the close of it. A resolute, patient, and faithful observance of this rule will secure all that is needed. The preacher must pay no regard to difficulties in the outset, must not be discouraged or chagrined by the bad logic or bad grammar of his earlier attempts, must not heed the remarks and still less the advice of fastidious hearers; but must prepare as carefully as possible for the task as it comes round to him, and perform it as earnestly, seriously and scrupulously as he does his daily devotions.* In course of time, he will find

*The following was the method of Dr. Blackburn, a distinguished Southern preacher, in making the *immediate* preparation for unwritten discourse, and we do not know of any better one. "In his studies and preparation for the pulpit, his plan was to fold a sheet of paper and lay it on his writing desk, and then commence walking backward and forward across the room, occasionally stopping to note down a head or leading subdivision of his thoughts, leaving considerable space under each note. Having thus arranged the plan of his discourse, which he called 'blazing his path,' borrowing a figure from back-woods life, he then proceeded to take up each head and subdivision separately, and amplify it in his mind, until he had thought his whole discourse through and through, stopping occasionally as before to jot down a word or thought, sometimes a sentence or an illustration, under each division, until he had finished. Then taking up the paper, he would usually con it over again and again, now blotting out, now adding something. Thus he continued, until every part of the discourse was satisfactorily arranged in his mind. The notes thus prepared he usually took with him into the pulpit, but he rarely had occasion even to glance at them. He used to remark 'I'll try to get the thoughts fully into my mind, and leave the language generally to the occasion.'"—PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, March, 1853.

The importance of an *early beginning*, as well as of a constant practice, in order to extemporaneous speaking, is illustrated by the following remark of Mr. Clay to the students of a law school. "I owe my success in life to one single fact, namely, that at the age of twenty-seven, I commenced, and continued for years, the practice of daily reading and speaking upon the con-

that it is becoming a pleasant process, and is exerting a most favorable influence upon his written sermons, and, indeed, upon his whole professional character. In each week, he should regularly preach one written sermon, and one unwritten sermon to "the great congregation." If the preacher must be confined to but one kind of discourse, then he should write. No man could meet the wants of an intelligent audience, year after year, who should always deliver unwritten discourses. But the clergy would be a more able and influential body of public teachers, if the two species of sermonizing were faithfully employed by them. The vigor and force of the unwritten sermon would pass over into the written, and render it more impressive and powerful than it now is, while the strict method and finished style of the written discourse would pass over into the unwritten. If the young clergyman lays down this rule in the outset, and proceeds upon it, it is safe to prophesy a successful career of extemporaneous preaching in his case. But if he does not lay it down *in the very outset*, if he delays until a more convenient season occurs for going up into the pulpit, and speaking without a manuscript, then it is almost absolutely certain that, like the majority of his associates in the ministry he will go through life never delivering a really excellent extemporaneous sermon.

We are confident that extemporaneous preaching should engage far more than it does, the labor and study of the clergy. The more we think of it, the more clearly shall we see that, as a species, it comes nearest to ideal perfection. It is a living utterance, out of a living heart and intellect, to living excited men, through no medium but the free air. It was the preaching of Christ and his apostles, of many of the early

tents of some historical or scientific book. These off-hand efforts were made sometimes in a cornfield, at others in the forest, and not unfrequently in some distant barn, with the horse and the ox for my auditors. It is to this early practice of the great art of all arts, that I am indebted for the primary and leading impulses that stimulated me forward, and have shaped my entire subsequent history."

Fathers, of Luther and the Reformers. And whenever any great movement has been produced, either in church or state, it has commonly taken its rise, so far as human agency is concerned, from the unwritten words of some man of sound knowledge, and thorough discipline, impelled to speak by strong feeling in his heart.

If the clergy would study the Bible with a closer and more penetrating exegesis,* and that theological system which has in it most of the solid substance of the Bible, with a more patient and scientific spirit; if they would habituate their intellects to long and connected trains of thought, and to a precise use of language; then, under the impulse of even no higher degree of piety than they now possess, greater results would follow from their preaching. When the clergy shall pursue theological studies, as Melancthon says he did, for personal spiritual benefit; when theological science shall be wrought into the very soul, inducing a theological mood; when thorough learning, and diligent self-discipline shall go hand in hand with deep love for God and souls; and when the clergy shall dare to *speak* to the people with extemporaneous boldness out of a full heart, full head, and clear mind, we may expect under the Divine blessing to see some of those great movements which characterized the ages of extempore preaching,—the age of the Apostles, the age of the Reformers, the age of John Knox in Scotland, the age of Wesley and Whitfield in England and America.

*The relation of exegetical study to sacred eloquence, and especially to extemporaneous preaching, deserves a separate discussion. There is no discipline so suggestive and fertilizing to the sermonizer, as the analytic examination of the revealed word. He who is accustomed to read a gospel, or an epistle, *over, and over, and over again*, in the original Greek, becomes so saturated with its revelations that he is as full of matter as Elihu the friend of Job, and must speak that he may be refreshed. A *single* philological perusal will not have this effect, but ten or twenty will.

ART. II.—THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS.

BY SAMUEL T. SPEAR, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE Elections of September, October and November last, in all embracing nineteen of the loyal States, have settled the question as to the ascendancy of the Republican party in the Fortieth Congress. To a large extent the Republican members of the Thirty-ninth Congress have been re-elected. In both Houses of the next Congress, the Republicans will have more than a two-thirds majority, and can therefore carry out their purposes of legislation in defiance of the Presidential veto. This is unquestionably a victory of Congress over the President. Both parties made an appeal to the popular judgment, and the result proves the appeal of the President to be a total failure, while that of Congress is a complete success.

The question which the people have determined by the late elections, is the great Problem of Reconstruction, submitted to the public judgment in a specific shape. The form of the question grew out of the conflict between the President and Congress, each having a specific plan for the reconstruction of the Rebel States, and neither being able to decide the point for the other. The discussion of the subject was thorough; the parties thereto did their best; ample time was given for consideration; probably no people ever voted with a better apprehension of the points at issue; on both sides it was claimed that the question to be decided was of the greatest importance; and in these circumstances of earnest effort and intense conflict, the sovereign people proceeded to express their will, indorsing the Thirty-ninth Congress, and condemning the President.

The great cause of this defeat on the one side, and victory on the other, is undoubtedly the difference between the policy of the President and that of Congress. The President's policy, though supported by the whole strength of the Demo-

cratic party, aided by the so called Johnson men, could not stand the test of the popular thought. It was not what the people expected at his hands. Probably no public man was ever more completely deserted, or severely condemned by those whose votes placed him in power. Congress, on the other hand, presented a plan of reconstruction which to the majority of the people seemed better suited to the exigence of the times and the future safety of the nation. As we doubt not, one of the serious obstacles greatly harming the cause of the President, consisted in the *man himself*. The disgraceful and mortifying circumstances connected with his inauguration as Vice-President; his speech in Washington on the 22nd of February, 1866; his singular tour through the country from Washington to Chicago and back again to Washington; the fact that he had abandoned the party that had chosen him to the Vice-Presidency, and was, moreover, wielding the patronage of the Government in favor of the Democratic party; the system of pardons by the wholesale granted to prominent Rebels—these, and the like circumstances were well calculated to bring the President into discredit with a large portion of the American people. They distrusted the man; and yet the chief cause of the President's failure must be sought in his policy of Reconstruction as compared with that of Congress. Here, mainly, the issue was joined; and here the verdict was rendered. Let us then for a moment look at the question as thus presented.

One of the elements in the case was the extreme *haste* of the President, amounting to absolute *rashness*. When the Rebellion was subdued, Congress was not in session, and if the President had acted wisely, he would have either convened this body, or waited till the regular session of Congress before committing himself to any policy of reconstruction. The former would have been the wiser course; yet either course would have given the Congress of the nation a full opportunity to act on the subject. There was no earthly reason why the President should take upon himself the whole responsibil-

ity of determining the method and principles of reconstruction. The position of things was novel. There were no precedents in our political history to guide him. The Constitution framed by the Fathers never contemplated such a terrible rebellion; and, moreover, Congress had not by legislation provided any plan for the re-adjustment of the Rebel States after their conquest. In such circumstances, the President ought not to have moved an inch towards reorganizing civil society in the conquered States, until the Congress of the nation had been fully heard. Such, we regret to say, was not his course. He proceeded at once to assume all the power of judgment and action in the case; issued his proclamation, created the office of Provisional Governors without authority of law, appointed the incumbents thereof, and fixed their salaries; provided for the calling of State Conventions; determined who should be voters for delegates to these Conventions; and required the Rebel States to comply with certain conditions as precedent to their rights of representation in Congress. All this the President did before Congress assembled, seemingly with the design of carrying the case as far as possible before it could be touched by any legislative action of the Government. And then when Congress convened, and showed a disposition not at once to accept the President's work as complete and final, the latter hastened to remove his Provisional Governors, and remit the Rebel States entirely to their local authorities. The whole movement from beginning to end has the appearance of great rashness. It looks like an effort to spring a *snap*-judgment upon Congress. It looks as if the President meant so to deal with the question, that Congress could do nothing but accept his action as final. This we think to be one of the reasons for the President's defeat at the bar of the popular judgment. His evident anxiety to make himself master of the occasion, and if possible blockade Congress, has justly secured his own failure. Such summary proceedings on the part of the Executive were not agreeable to the American people.

A *second* element in the case was supplied by the President's most unwarrantable *assumption of power*, not only with-

out authority of law, but against law. There is not a solitary clause of the Constitution which gives him even the shadow of a legal right to do what he was proposing to do. It does not belong to the office of the President to organize State governments out of any materials, loyal or disloyal, where none exists. This is the business of Congress, providing therefor by special legislation, and always judging whether such governments be Republican in their form or not. The President admitted that the governments of the Rebel States had, and could have, no valid existence under the Constitution of the United States; and if so, then the people had no constitutional State governments. Legally they were in the condition of chaos. They were conquered subjects, justly exposed to the penalty of law for their crimes. Was it then the province of the President to take these subjugated rebels in this state, reorganize civil society among them, restore them to their normal relations to the Government, and that too without any legislation of Congress either guiding or controlling his action? All this he assumes to have done; but where did he get the authority for so doing? This question of authority was before the public mind; it was thoroughly argued, and it was conclusively shown that the President's action was without any authority of law, and hence, legally considered, null and void. Those who defended the President in the late canvass instinctively shunned this question, while his opponents set it forth in glaring colors. The people in pronouncing their judgment upon this branch of the case, have said to the President, that he must hereafter learn to confine his action to the constitutional powers and duties of his office. The people are not prepared to indorse the usurpation of independent legislative powers by the executive officer of the Government; and they have told him so by the late elections. They are not prepared to have the President violate the laws of Congress, as he certainly did in creating the office of Provisional Governors without any legal warrant, and fixing their salaries, and ordering the payment of the same from the public treasury.

A *third* and equally formidable element in the case as it stood before the public mind, was the *result* of the presidential policy. This no candid man could conceal from his eye. It was as palpable as the sun in the heavens at midday. The fact was notorious, that the Senators and Representatives from the Rebel States, chosen under the President's policy, were for the most part, men who, within less than the period of a year, had occupied official positions, civil or military, in conducting a war of treason against the life of this nation,—men who could not take the test oath without perjury,—men who submitted to the national authority simply because they had no power to resist it,—men who would have been in their graves if the criminal laws of the country had been executed upon them. These are the men who appeared in Washington, under the President's plan, to take part in the legislative counsels of the nation. It is not surprising that Congress should hesitate, or that the people should doubt the wisdom and safety of such a process of reconciliation.

It was equally important that the States as reconstructed according to this plan were not in a fit condition to enjoy the right of representation in Congress. Infamous traitors were the men placed in power ; they held the State offices and enacted and executed the State laws ; and true Union men, who had never bowed the knee to Baal were persecuted, and in many instances, as at New Orleans and elsewhere, murdered for their loyalty. Treason was found to be the passport to favor, and loyalty during the war the badge of proscription and dishonor. Southern Unionists complained most bitterly of the President's policy. They declared it to be their curse and their ruin. This state of things was made known at the North, and doubtless had its powerful effect on the public mind. Indeed, the people could not see what had been gained by the so-called reconstruction of the President. He might as well have taken the State Governments just as they were when the Rebellion was overthrown, and declared them to be loyal, without any process of mere *sham* reconstruction. The reconstruction of the President seemed

very like a farce, since it left substantially the same men in power. No mark of dishonor was placed upon the traitor, and no disability of any kind imposed upon him for his crimes. This certainly was a very singular mode of making treason "odious."

A *fourth* element in the case, was the interest which the people felt in the welfare and safety of the *Freedmen*. For them the President's plan made no provision, and to them it secured no protection. It simply left them to the tender mercies of State legislation wholly managed by the white race. The fact was well known, that slavery had not been abolished with the good will of a majority of the people at the South. It was a matter of compulsion rather than of choice. Southern public sentiment had undergone no change on the subject of Negro slavery. State laws in relation to testimony, contracts, labor, property, vagrancy, and apprenticeship, enacted with special reference to the *Freedmen*, might virtually reproduce the system of slavery, not in name, but in substance. Such a state of things did not meet the views of a majority of the Northern people, who were determined to keep their pledge with the *Freedman*, to make his freedom a fact, and render it impossible to evade it by any system of partial and unjust legislation. The colored people at the South had abundantly proved their loyalty; in the hour of national peril they were sought and accepted as useful allies: large numbers of them had borne arms against the Rebellion: to them the nation had in the most sacred manner pledged its faith: even Mr. Johnson on one occasion promised to be their "Moses:" they were, moreover, disfranchised, and hence powerless to protect themselves: and surely it was not to be expected, that the country would look with indifference upon the condition and fate of this people. To have done so would have been an act of treachery and ingratitude well worthy of the curse of Heaven. We heartily thank God, that the *Freedman* is not to be left where he would have been left, if the policy of the President had been approved by the people.

A *fifth* element entering into the canvass, and affecting the

public judgment, grew out of the *contingent questions of the future*. It was readily seen, that the President's policy provided no guarantee for the national debt, and equally that it supplied no prohibition against the future payment of the rebel debt, or making compensation for the emancipation of slaves. Here were grave questions lying in the problem of the future, involving thousands of millions of dollars, and left open to any system of bargain and sale among those who make a trade of politics. It is quite certain, too, that on these points the Rebel States, if admitted to their seats in Congress, would have marched as a solid column in one direction, ready to ally themselves with any political party at the North that would favor their views. It would not have been long before some or all of these questions would have been launched upon Congress, greatly to the damage of the National credit. Thoughtful and reflecting men saw this peril, and judged it best, as we think very wisely, to place such grave interests entirely beyond the reach of party politics.

Still *another* branch of the case was drawn from the essential *falseness* of the main arguments urged in behalf of the President's policy. It was insisted by the President and his supporters, that the Rebel States had a constitutional right to be represented in Congress the moment the war ceased. The right at once sprang into being of itself, without any conditions, and without any legislative action on the part of the Government. Some went so far as to affirm, that the right was perfect and intact even during the war. It was simply not used.

Such a doctrine of State Rights struck the American people as being absolutely monstrous. It perfectly ignores the distinction that exists between things as wide apart as heaven and hell. A loyal State, and a State in rebellion against the National Government, are not parallel cases. They do not stand on the same basis of rights under the Constitution. The one is a political community in every way qualified to be represented in Congress: and the other, a political community without any State officers constitutionally competent to pro-

vide for this representation. True, the Rebel State is not out of the Union in the sense of being released from its obligations; but it is out in the sense of having *forfeited* its privileges, and in the further sense of its own incapacity to resume the relations of a loyal State except by some governmental action to define the method, and also to say when the thing is accomplished. This the President virtually conceded when he proceeded to reconstruct the Rebel States. Had he done the same things in a loyal State, he would have been impeached as an usurper. The argument against Congress, as drawn from the so-called rights of the Rebel States, fell therefore with very poor grace from the lips of those who indorsed the President. Though an utterly false argument, still it condemned everything that he had done from top to bottom. It was indeed said during the canvass, that by the action of the President, the status of this question had been essentially altered, and that although the Rebel States were not at first entitled to representation in the National Congress, still the right became perfect when they complied with the conditions of the President. Then they were loyal States. So said the President; and so said his supporters. To this it was replied, as we think conclusively, that the President had no authority to do what he professed to have done. Such was the judgment of the people, not only condemning the President for his assumption of power, but equally repudiating the main argument which was urged in behalf of the right of immediate and unconditional representation in Congress on the part of the Rebel States. The verdict of the people upon this question we think to be right.

The cause of the President was further embarrassed by his *party affiliations*. In this respect he presented a very singular spectacle before the public. Nothing was clearer than that he had deliberately forsaken the party to which he was indebted for his election to the Vice Presidency; and that he was doing all he could to secure its defeat. He left his old friends and went over to his old enemies. True, he was taken up by the Democratic party; yet this party was largely in

the minority in the loyal States. He was cordially welcomed and praised by the Rebels, and by all the sympathizers with the Rebellion. He had changed his position; and as the result, those who carried the country safely through the war, ceased to be his supporters, and became his political opponents. Many of them severely denounced him, not without much occasion for doing so; and the great mass of them entirely refused to trust him. The Philadelphia Convention, got up in the interests of the President, proved a total failure. The people saw that it was nothing but a heartless coalition for the purposes of political power. The expedient did not take with the popular mind; and the whole thing came to its deserved fate.

Such, as we judge, are some of the prominent causes to which the President owes his defeat. They are quite sufficient to explain the result. A more marked defeat has not occurred in the history of American politics. A sweeping and overwhelming majority has distinctly said, that the President's policy shall not go into effect. The public sentiment created by the war, has simply proved true to itself in demanding something more and something safer, as a final settlement of the questions growing out of the Rebellion.

Turning now for a moment to the *other* side of the issue, which has been equally determined by the people, we come to the Constitutional Amendment proposed by Congress. The principles contained in this amendment are unquestionably the principles which have carried the election so triumphantly in favor of the Republican party. What are these principles? This question deserves a brief notice.

The *first* section of the amendment declares, that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside." It further declares, that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to

any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The justice of this section lies upon its very face. It determines who is a citizen of the United States and also of the State in which he resides; and then, as to what are termed *civil* rights, it places *all* citizens on the same basis of equality before the laws, entirely ignoring the question of color or caste, and precluding the possibility of all class legislation in respect to these rights. This is as it should be. Whoever resists the principle affirmed in this section is the enemy of popular government. The security which it affords to the Freedman, is just the security which the nation is bound to afford to all men.

The *second* section provides, that "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of Electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the Members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."

It is readily seen, that this section bases representation in the lower House of Congress upon population, and also leaves the question of *political franchise*, where it has always been left, with the State. It, however, declares that if any State denies the right of voting to any class of its male inhabitants, being citizens of the United States, twenty-one years of age, and not guilty of rebellion or other crime, then the class so disfranchised, shall not be counted as a basis of political power in the Union. This is certainly just and fair as between the several States. In its moral effect it supplies a motive

against political oligarchies in the State. It fosters, and to some extent guarantees, the democratic principle. It makes it the political interest of the Southern States to enfranchise the colored population. It is perhaps the shortest and surest road to impartial suffrage. It adjusts the Constitution to the new condition of things, which has grown out of the Rebellion. It submits to the Southern States this alternative:—either to grant the right of suffrage to the colored people, or accept the consequence of not having them counted as an element of political power in the Union, to be wielded by white men. The abolition of slavery renders this section necessary, since without it the Rebel States will increase their political power in consequence of the war. This section may be unwelcome to the South; yet the North, as we think, will never consent to have a politically disfranchised class of American citizens used as the basis of power by the very men, who insist upon this state of things. The decree of the popular judgment has gone forth, and is not likely to be reversed.

The *third* section provides, that "no person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or Elector of President or Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State Legislature, or as an Executive or Judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability."

The disability imposed by this section, is confined to *perjured* traitors: and in respect to them it simply declares that they shall be ineligible to any office, whether State or Federal, unless Congress by the requisite vote shall judge it best to restore to them this privilege. The disability aims at the very men, upon whom rests the chief guilt of the Rebellion. Perjured traitors took advantage of their official position to commit treason against the United States. Such atrocious crimi-

nals ought to be ineligible to office, whether State or Federal. This is the very least that an outraged country can demand. It falls immensely short of the offence. The provision for removing this forfeiture places these offenders on their good behavior, and thus mingles mercy with justice. So far as we can judge, these gentlemen do not as yet give any signs of penitence for their treason. They have simply been defeated : and if there were any prospect of success, they would be likely at once to renew the war. Some of them are as treasonable in their feelings, and would, if they could, be as treasonable in their practice, as they were at any time during the Rebellion. Such men ought not to hold office. They ought to "take the back seats," and then stay there till an outraged Government shall at least have time to take a very good observation of them. This is required for the safety of the nation. Indeed, if there be any just objection to this section, it must consist in its extreme mildness. No such leniency would be practised in any other country. If the Southern people resist the principle contained in this section, the fact will furnish conclusive proof that they are not truly loyal to the Government, and hence not in a fit condition to be represented in Congress. To the Northern people this section seems not only necessary, but eminently mild and magnanimous. Less than this the South will not be likely to get at the hands of the victorious North. There is a deep feeling at the North on the subject of treason, which the Government has utterly failed to express in its treatment of the traitor : and this feeling will never consent that the men who have combined perjury with treason, shall walk into the halls of Congress, or any other halls of official power, with no legal mark of dishonor placed upon them. This would be too much for a loyal people to endure.

The *fourth* section provides, that "the validity of the public debt of the United States, authorised by law, including debts incurred for the payment of pensions and bounties for suppressing insurrection and rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or

pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of slaves : but all such debts, obligations, or claims shall be held illegal and void."

This section proposes to make the national debt absolutely sacred, and at the same time render it constitutionally impossible for the General Government, or any of the States, to assume or pay any portion of the Rebel debt. It also forbids any compensation for the emancipation of slaves. The section is obviously just what ought to be incorporated in a plan of reconstruction, whose object is to restore to their political privileges and powers the very communities out of whose treasonable conduct have grown the questions referred to. These questions ought to be settled *when* we are restoring these communities, so as to put them beyond the reach of debate *after* they are restored. The settlement, too, ought to be placed in the fundamental law of the land. The bond-holders of the Rebel debt, and the ex-masters of slaves, will of course not favor this section ; it does not move in the line of their interests ; they would doubtless be glad to have these points left open for future consideration : and this is a very important reason why the section should be passed, so as to guard all parties against temptation on the one hand, and the nation against any dangerous agitation on the other.

The *fifth* and last section provides, that " Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this Article." If the amendment be passed, then Congress, as the legislative branch of the Government, ought to be invested with sufficient power to carry it into practical execution. Whatever legislation may be necessary to this end, it will be the duty of Congress to supply.

We have now looked at both sides of the issue between the President and Congress, as it was presented to the people in the recent elections. The result is just what might have reasonably been expected. The cause of the President was essentially weak, and that of Congress essentially strong : and this gave the latter great advantage over the former before

the people. Congress, without making any attack upon the President, or even nullifying what he had done without any legal authority, simply proposed to remedy, so far as possible, the defects of his policy. For this purpose it added the Constitutional Amendment, submitting it to the calm deliberation of the American people. This Amendment, though extremely mild in its character, is nevertheless sufficiently radical and effective to be a safe basis of settlement. So the people judged. In electing members to the Fortieth Congress they have virtually voted for this Amendment: and, as we doubt not, most of the Legislatures of the loyal States will in due season confirm this judgment.

The President in his unnecessary conflict with Congress, and especially in his language of violent and unjust denunciation, committed the greatest mistake ever committed by a President of these United States. He did not seem to understand the Northern people, or the proprieties of his own office. His speeches, during his political tour to Chicago, were any thing but fitting in one who was the Chief Magistrate of a great nation. The vanity, weakness, indiscretion, and bad temper of the man, no one could fail to perceive. That political tour doubtless cost him a great many thousand votes. The like was never seen before in this country: and we sincerely hope that it may never be witnessed again. One such spectacle is surely quite enough for the whole life-time of a nation.

Passing now to the problem of the *immediate future*, we meet three important questions. First, what ought the President to do? Secondly, what ought Congress to do, considered as the representative of the victorious party? Thirdly, what will be the course of the States not yet represented in Congress? On each of these questions we submit a brief comment.

First, what ought the President to do? The answer to this question we hold to be very simple. Nothing is plainer than that the President ought cheerfully to yield to the decision of the public judgment. To that judgment he made his appeal; and the verdict is against him, coming too from the court of

final jurisdiction. The President may have his own private opinions ; yet any official or factious opposition to the will of the people legally expressed, any proscription of men because not supporting his policy, any further denunciation of Congress, any efforts to defeat the Constitutional Amendment, will in him be both a blunder and a crime. The people have spoken ; their voice cannot be mistaken ; and the President must abide by it. To resist it will be useless. The logic of events is stronger than the will of any single man. During his whole term of service the President will have in both Houses of Congress more than a two-thirds majority against his policy, and this majority he cannot safely defy. It will hence be wise in him, as a public man, to accept the situation, and act accordingly.

Secondly, what should Congress do ? It will be well for the members of Congress to bear in mind, that their main business is not to fight the President, merely for the sake of the opposition, but rather to attend to the public interests. A good and sensible temper of mind will be a long step towards wise legislation. Mere passion seldom does the right thing. Large majorities sometimes fail to act wisely, simply because they are conscious of their strength. The Thirty-ninth Congress, as opposed to the policy of the President, is strong : and so will be the Fortieth. Both express and embody a public sentiment, which has thoroughly repudiated the President's policy.

As to the question of admitting Senators and Representatives from the excluded States, we think that the Thirty-ninth Congress ought firmly to maintain its present position. It has been instructed to do so by the people. It stands committed to the principles of the Constitutional Amendment ; and until sufficient time is given to determine whether the people will adopt or reject its provisions, Congress has no moral right to recede from these principles. We assume that the Constitutional Amendment was not an electioneering card merely to catch votes. We supported it as a genuine policy, believing Congress to be perfectly sincere in proposing it, and ready to

carry it into practical effect in the event of its approval by the people. It contains the principles upon which the people, by a decisive majority, have expressed their judgment ; and by this judgment Congress is morally bound. The introduction of new and different terms of reconstruction would, in the present stage of the case, be virtually a breach of faith. It would justly expose Congress to censure. No such effort ought to be made. If the Amendment shall be constitutionally passed, then Congress, whether it be the Thirty-ninth or the Fortieth, ought in good faith to apply its principles by appropriate legislation, and in conformity therewith admit Senators and Representatives from the Rebel States to their seats. If, however, the Amendment shall fail for want of the constitutional majority, then the whole question of reconstruction will be thrown open for future discussion. Till this point is ascertained, we hold that Congress is bound to reject all new propositions of every name and nature. How much time it will take to settle the point, we cannot tell. It obviously cannot be done in a moment. The public mind, both North and South, should not be hurried. Let it have time to think, and time to place its decision in a legal form. In due season, and that too at no distant day, we shall know the result.

During the canvass some of the speakers who were members of Congress, intimated that the President ought to be impeached for his misdemeanors in office. The intimation is not without many acts on the part of the President, giving it at least some color of plausibility. He certainly has been very unwise, even if he has committed no positive misdemeanors. It will, however, be well for Congress to remember that the impeachment of the President of these United States is a very serious business. It is true, that the Constitution provides for this resort in certain cases ; yet the remedy ought to be clearly demanded by the Constitution as well as by the public safety, before the thing is attempted, and certainly before it is done. Political considerations should not enter into the question. Whether a bill of impeachment would legally lie against the President or not, we do not

undertake to decide ; yet without some further developments, making it necessary, we are fully of the opinion that it should not be tried. It is highly *inexpedient*. It would probably do vastly more harm than good. It would throw the country into a state of confusion and angry excitement, and might involve us in civil war. As matters now stand, we should regard it as an exceedingly dangerous experiment, not called for by any imperative necessity. It is, we think, strongly probable that public sentiment in the loyal States would not sustain Congress in such a measure. It is true, that the people have rejected the policy of the President, and severely condemned his acts. As reasons governing their votes, they have listened to the discussions which have set forth the usurpations and unconstitutional procedures of the President ; but actual impeachment with removal from office is a very different question. This involves first, a bill of impeachment framed by the House of Representatives, and then a formal trial by the Senate. If the President were found guilty, it would involve his removal from office, and the election of a new President to fill the vacancy. We have no idea that the country would judge this to be wise under the present circumstances. We are quite sure, that it would be the worst possible policy for Congress. With more than a two-thirds majority against him in both Houses, Congress can better afford to let the President live out his Constitutional days ; and then he will die without any excitement, trouble, or expense to the people. The effort to shorten his official life might make him a martyr. For the credit of American institutions as well as the general peace and safety of society, we want to see no such efforts, certainly not until the occasion becomes much more pressing and imperative.

Thirdly, what course will be pursued by the Rebel States not yet represented in Congress ? This is a very important question to them, and not unimportant to the whole nation. There is nothing in the Amendment itself, or in the legislation of Congress, to exclude these States from voting on the subject. We presume that their votes will be counted in de-

termining the result. This may seem inconsistent with the denial of their right of immediate representation in Congress. Under ordinary circumstances it would be so ; yet whatever inconsistency there may be between these two things, is due to the course pursued by the President. If he had waited for the action of Congress, there would have been no trouble in the case. He did not wait ; and hence Congress was compelled, either to declare his action null and void, or to *arrest* his policy by refusing to admit Senators and Representatives from the States re-constructed under this policy, and adding thereto a supplement to remedy, as far as possible, its main defects. The latter expedient was chosen by Congress. In choosing it Congress, as we suppose, meant to leave the Amendment open to the vote of all the States.

It will require the affirmative vote of at least twenty-seven States to pass this Amendment ; and as there are but thirty-six States now in the Union, at least one of the ten excluded States must vote for it, even if all the States now represented in Congress should give an affirmative vote. It is probable that the legislatures of Kentucky, Delaware, and Maryland will vote against the Amendment : and hence its ratification, in this event, will need the approving vote of at least four of the non-represented States. Some of these States have already rejected the Amendment : at present it seems quite likely that the others will follow in the same line. We doubt not that a favorable word from the President would greatly help the matter : but this word he is not likely to utter. He may change his mind, having already done so several times : yet we see no present indications of any such change.

Will it then be best for the non-represented States to set themselves against the Amendment, and attempt to tire out the North by the mere force of resistance and delay ? What are their prospects of success, and what will they gain by it ? We predict their total failure in the effort. The Northern people are in earnest upon this question. Having conquered the Rebellion, they mean to prescribe the terms upon which the Rebel States shall be brought into their normal relations

to the Government. Such terms, at once fair, mild and reasonable, have already been offered, and if these terms are not accepted by the South, then it will doubtless be some time before any others more agreeable will be offered. The loyal States carried on the Government during the war without the aid of the revolted States : and they can carry it on, and they will do so, until these States shall conclude to accept the terms which their conquerors deem just and right. The Rebel States will not be permitted to be dictators in respect to these terms. They must accept the terms, and make the best of their own situation. If they decline to do so, then they will not be represented in Congress, nor will they participate in the next Presidential election : and besides this, they will have upon them all the evils affecting industry and commerce, incident to such an unsettled state of Southern society. As a simple question of endurance, the loyal States can stand this condition of things much better than the South. As a question of purpose, we see no prospect that the Northern majority will recede from its ground, and offer terms more agreeable to the South. The Democratic party does not control the Government, and there is no hope that it ever will do so without the aid of the South ; and this aid it cannot have so long as the Rebel States are not represented in Congress. The Democratic party cannot therefore help these States : it may advocate their cause : but the Republican Union party, as represented in Congress, is the party that must settle the question. The President cannot help them against a two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress. They must help themselves by accepting the proffered terms. Easier and better terms they will not be likely to get.

If the same terms had been proposed immediately after the conquest of the Rebellion, the Southern people, as we doubt not, would have accepted them very gladly. Then they were prepared to accept almost anything. They felt themselves to be a conquered people, subject to the will of their conquerors : and such they were, and such they are to-day. The facts of their condition are not essentially altered. They are a people

that must make terms with the Government by accepting its terms. They have no other alternative unless they propose to fight again. The sooner they understand this, the sooner they will appreciate the demands of their own situation.

We have no spite to gratify against the Southern people ; we do not wish to protract the ordeal of their sufferings, or unnecessarily delay their representation in Congress ; yet we have no idea of submitting to their dictation in fixing the terms of final settlement. They are the offenders and the vanquished ; and if the principles so overwhelmingly approved at the recent elections, be rejected by the South, then the North, acting through the Government, will try again. The next trial, if there be one, will, as we predict, be very much more radical. If mild means will not answer, then stronger ones must and will be used.

What will be the moral effect of the recent elections, we cannot tell ; yet the Southern people ought to be instructed thereby. We sincerely hope they will be. We advise them to take counsel of their sober, second thoughts. They had better lay their bluster aside, and dismiss from public confidence those prejured traitors who are the chief cause of their calamities. Things are not by any means as they were. The people at the South are not where they were before the Rebellion. Slavery is legally dead. The South is terribly prostrated in its industry and its resources. The people greatly need that quietude and regular movement of civil society, which would grow out of their representation in Congress. By delay they simply afflict themselves, and make their condition worse. They gain nothing, and can gain nothing, by resisting the deliberately expressed will of those who have rescued this nation from the traitor's grasp. That will is strong ; it rests on good reasons ; and it must at last prevail. The public sentiment of the loyal States must and will settle the questions at issue ; and the South must abide by the settlement as thus determined.

There is a question which has not as yet been considered in this article, because it was not directly involved in the issue

between the President and Congress. We allude to the question of Negro Suffrage. So far as the Constitutional Amendment is concerned, this point is left to the decision of the respective States. Many, possibly a majority of the Northern people, would have been glad to vote in favor of *impartial* suffrage irrespective of color or caste; yet Congress did not think it best to submit this question in the proposed Amendment. It was consequently no part of the issue before the people. It cannot with propriety now be added, as a new plank in the basis of reconstruction, by the Republican party, unless the Constitutional Amendment shall fail of adoption. That party is honorably committed to the Amendment till its fate is determined. If it shall fail, then of course the whole subject will be again opened for discussion.

Expressing an individual opinion, we should be glad to see in the Constitution of the United States, an article that would define citizenship in the *political* sense, and *make it uniform* throughout all the states, and that too in respect to all the officers of government whether State or Federal, for whom the people vote. We should be glad also to have such a definition as would entirely ignore the question of color or caste, and thus make suffrage *impartial*. We should be glad still further to have the test of *intelligence* applied to the right of suffrage, as indicated by the capacity to read and write. This we think to be the true doctrine, just to all parties, and safe for society. At present there is a very strong prejudice at the South, and to some extent at the North, against putting the ballot into the hands of the Negro on equal terms with white men; yet we have never been able to see any good reason for this prejudice. If the Negro, as a citizen, may be taxed to support the Government, and compelled to fight for it, we do not see why he should not have the right of voting like all other men. Why exclude him on the ground of his color, or apply to him a test not applied to others in similar circumstances. The whole thing is wrong upon its very face. The day is not distant when, as we hope, the American people will correct this wrong. The colored population at the South is

so numerous, being the majority in some of the States, that the white people will in the end have to concede to it the right of suffrage upon some fair and equal basis. The Constitutional Amendment, if adopted, would furnish a very powerful argument for so doing; yet the obvious justice of the thing is after all the best reason for it. It is always expedient to do right. The question will never be finally settled until it is settled in this way.

Moreover, that which is thus right in itself, and which ought therefore to be the choice of the white people at the South, yea, of all people everywhere, *may* become an absolute necessity to the General Government. It was so with the abolition of slavery; and it may be so with the question of political franchise. If the Rebel States as reconstructed by the President, will not accept the terms as now proposed, then it may become the duty of Congress to declare the reconstruction of the President to be null and void because without authority or force of law, and provide for the organization of State governments, on the basis of *loyal* and *impartial* suffrage irrespective of color. Congress, in proposing the Constitutional Amendment, attempted to patch up and supplement the President's work without essentially disturbing it; but if this will not answer, then there remains a more radical method of cure. The final disposal of the Southern States is not yet an accomplished fact. Congress has not yet recognized their right of representation; and it will not do so, until the proposed Amendment is adopted, or, in the event of its failure, something else substituted therefor quite as effective. At present, Congress is very properly restrained by its own action, and by the voice of the people in approving that action; but this status of the case will not last a moment beyond the rejection of the Constitutional Amendment. This point being ascertained by the refusal of the Rebel States to accept the terms proposed, then the whole question is open, *de novo*, from beginning to end. This time, too, the Congress of the United States, and not the President, will provide for organizing State governments, and see to it that the materials are such,

both in officers and constituences, that these governments will cheerfully act in harmony with the Government of the United States. Out of this governmental necessity may grow Negro Suffrage, with the disfranchisement of Rebels. Things may come to this pass.

The rejection of the Amendment by the Rebel States, as now organized, will furnish very strong proof that the colored people, and the unquestionably loyal white people, form the proper basis with which to begin civil society in these States. Hence, if the leaders of Southern opinion want the mildest measure to which the North will consent, let them take the Amendment, and thank God for so good a fortune. If, on the other hand, they want something stronger, something that will more emphatically place its mark on treason, then let them reject the Amendment. While the Northern people mean to be magnanimous, they nevertheless understand their strength of numbers and their strength of resources. Having conquered treason with the sword, they have now conquered the President with the ballot. They have the Government in their hands : and hence they can, and in the last resort *will*, compel the South practically to acquiesce in their views of reconstruction. It will not be wise for those who manage matters in the South, to carry their defiance of Northern opinions too far. They have already done this thing once ; and they may do it again. A lenient Government and a generous people are now waiting for their action ; and now is eminently the time for them to act wisely.

The Southern people should not forget, that we have had a war,—a desperate and desolating war, costing immense sums of money, and involving vast sacrifices of life,—a war of the Government against those who defied its authority. This is the sober fact in the case. Moreover, in this contest the Government is the winner, and the Southern people are the losers. They claimed the right to secede from the Union ; and this the Government denied. The question was fought out to absolute victory on the one side, and absolute defeat on the other. The Government being the victorious party, possesses

both the right and the power of prescribing the terms of peace, limited only by the Constitution and the general laws of humanity. As a conquered people, the South would do well to keep these things in mind. They are not, by any means, the sovereign and independent masters of their own situation. When, and in what way, with what conditions and guarantees, they shall again be represented in Congress, is a question for those to decide who are the conquerors of the Rebellion. This right as the victors, they claim ; and this right, we believe, they will exercise. Southern society must be organized upon a loyal basis ; its State Governments must be loyal ; and if Negro suffrage be necessary to this end, then the rejection of the Constitutional Amendment, by the South, will simply turn all loyal eyes at the North in the direction of such suffrage.

There is a sentiment quite prevalent at the North, which finds its expression in the motto of *Universal Amnesty and Impartial Suffrage*. Its advocates claim that this motto contains the true solution of the national problem. We confess, however, that we see no necessary connection between these two things. They may both be right ; or they may both be wrong ; or the one may be right, and the other wrong. We are in favor of impartial suffrage upon its own merits ; it is just and right ; but whether we shall pay universal amnesty to all traitors as the price of this suffrage, is a very different question. We should be truly sorry to see the Government, or the loyal people acting through the Government, engaged in the work of making a bargain with the Rebel States,—one of the contracting parties conceding universal amnesty in exchange for impartial suffrage ; and the other conceding impartial suffrage in exchange for universal amnesty. We are not quite ready for such a trade as a method of settling the whole account. The plain truth is, we do not propose to make any bargains, and certainly not this one, with those who have rebelled against the Government of the United States. Having conquered them by force of arms, we propose to designate the terms on which they may recover their lost status in the Union, and then insist upon their compliance with these terms. This

is the proper way of closing up the accounts of an unsuccessful rebellion. This is what Congress has attempted to secure in the Constitutional Amendment, already ratified by several of the States, and only waiting for the requisite vote to make it a complete success. Those who advocated this Amendment *before* the election, should not, as we think, change their ground immediately *after* the election. They should wait till the fate of this specific measure is decided. It will then be time enough for a new programme, provided one be necessary. This is not the time to distract and divide the public mind with a new basis of settlement.

We have, moreover, no evidence that the Southern States would accept universal amnesty in exchange for impartial suffrage. Suppose that the loyal States were all ripe for such a bargain, what then? Are the Rebel States equally ready? They may come to it at last; yet at present they are not prepared for it, and they will not be without further discipline. If there is any one thing upon which they are more set than another, it is that the Negro shall not be made *politically* equal to white men. Even loyal Southerners are not yet at all unanimous in accepting Negro Suffrage. The public mind of the South must be greatly changed before a majority of the people will favor this view. We cannot, therefore, see any probable gain in the way of time, by an effort to trade off universal amnesty in exchange for impartial suffrage. In obviating one objection we simply run against another quite as formidable. Universal amnesty would of course be acceptable to the South; but it would not be so with impartial suffrage. Each of these ideas would be advocated, and each opposed, on its own respective grounds. There is no prospect, that, taken in their combination, they would be more acceptable, either North or South, than the Constitutional Amendment now before the people.

How, we beg to inquire, shall the contracting parties make the proposed exchange? Shall it be done by State legislation? State legislation is a thing that may very easily be altered. It has no necessary permanency. The Rebel States be-

ing restored by conceding impartial suffrage, might the very next day after the restoration withdraw the concession. There would be nothing to prevent them from doing it. State legislation evidently will not answer.

Shall the bargain be guaranteed by being placed in the fundamental law of the land? This would require another Constitutional Amendment, defining the doctrine of suffrage in respect to all the States, involving the question whether the States would surrender their long conceded right of deciding upon this point, and also involving the still further question, whether they would agree, by the requisite majority, to make the proposed bargain. We are in favor of impartial suffrage, and always have been; yet we do not see that such an Amendment, if now submitted as a substitute for the one already before the people, would be likely to hasten the process of reconstruction. It would be much more likely to postpone it. It would open an entirely new subject, upon which the public mind has not yet indicated its position.

There are some points, too, in the Constitutional Amendment as proposed by Congress, that we would not surrender even for impartial suffrage. The second section would of course be rendered useless by such suffrage; but the other sections would not lose their importance or value. The first section, which defines citizenship in the United States and in all the States, and guarantees the civil rights of all men against all interference by State legislation; the third, which makes perjured traitors ineligible to office, unless Congress shall remove the disability: the fourth, which guarantees the national debt, and prohibits the payment of the rebel debt, and also any compensation for the loss or emancipation of slaves; the fifth, which gives Congress the power to execute these provisions by appropriate legislation:— these sections contain principles and guarantees for the nation's safety, that would not be rendered improper and unnecessary, even if impartial suffrage were conceded. They stand upon their own basis, and are not essentially affected, one way or the other, by such suffrage. The granting of suffrage to the

Negro is surely no reason why the Constitution should not guarantee the civil rights of all men ; nor is it a reason why universal amnesty should be extended to traitors ; nor again is it a reason for leaving the questions pertaining to the national debt, the rebel debt, and compensation for the loss of slaves, open to future agitation. It really has but very little, if anything, to do with these questions. These questions stand upon their own merits, and should be decided accordingly. Those who seem willing to sell out the Constitutional Amendment, and take impartial suffrage as the equivalent, lack, as we think, what Locke terms "the round-about common-sense view" of the subject. They are so much occupied with a single idea, that they lose sight of other very important matters. They assume, as we think, without sufficient data, that impartial suffrage, so excellent in itself, would at once solve the whole problem. This we do not see. It may be so ; yet we do not see this mighty power of adjustment and cure in simply granting the ballot to the Negro, especially if we must pay universal amnesty as the price of the boon. The remedy costs a good deal, to begin with ; and then when we have it, we are far from being certain that it would cure the disease. There is nothing in the history of political therapeutics to show, that impartial suffrage is the sure cure for all the wounds and bruises inflicted by a great rebellion.

Indeed, this whole method of dealing with the question, virtually puts the government into the attitude of a *trader* coming down from its high position gained by victory, and asking the conquered States to unite with it as equals in an effort to adjust the terms of settlement. They are solicited to concede as much as they can, upon the pledge that they shall be met with corresponding concessions. The Government graciously moves towards them with universal amnesty for a bribe, and they as graciously move towards the Government with impartial suffrage for the equivalent ; and thus the two parties finally come together, provided they have the good fortune to agree upon the terms. This, we confess, looks like a very queer sequel to a defeated rebellion. During the

progress of the war we expected, in the event of victory, to dictate the terms of settlement; and we still expect to do so. Those who fight against a just Government must take the consequences of fighting, from which they may perhaps learn not to fight a second time. We are quite willing to hear what they have to say, and give it all due weight; but further than this we do not propose to go. From this position we do not recede to the breadth of a hair. We do not believe, that the loyal people, whose valor has saved the country, are just now in a mood to *ask* for terms. As to these terms they have acquired the supreme right of being *judges*. It will be best for conquered rebels to be modest, and wait in patience while patriots, robed in victory, take counsel upon the national problem.

We cannot forbear, in now closing this article, to express our profound regret that the President should have so seriously complicated and embarrassed this whole subject by what seems to us a series of remarkable blunders. Had he waited for the action of Congress, and then had the good sense to co-operate with Congress, we believe that the problem of reconstruction would ere this have been solved. In his anxiety to do the thing rapidly, and upon his own authority, he has greatly delayed the work, and made the task increasingly difficult. Sincerely do we hope, that the lesson taught by the recent elections, may find in the President a willing pupil, and in the Southern States profited observers.

ART. III.—THE GREETINGS OF PAUL.

BY REV. J. B. BITTINGER, Sewickley, Penn.

The simplest form of greeting, when both parties are present, is *χαῖρε*, II. John, 10, 11. Sometimes the presence of the person addressed is recognized by his title, *e. g.* "Hail

Rabbi," in Matt. xxvi, 49—our "How do you do, *Sir!*" When these compliments were exchanged through letters, the only additions were the names of the greeter and the greeted. In the simplest form therefore of a greeting there are only these three parts: THE GREETER, THE GREETED, THE GREETING. Each of these elements admits of variation, enlargement, but with the exception of the titles of the parties between whom the correspondence was carried on, it does not appear that there was increase or variation. In Acts xxiii, 26—we have almost the naked parts of a gratulatory address. "Claudius Lysias" (the simple name of the person greeting) to "Felix" (the name of the person greeted), with his official title, "governor," and also the complimentary term, "most excellent" (xxiv, 3, xxvi, 25, Lu. 1, 3)—and the salutation: "Greeting."* This current secular form passed over to the church, and was used in its correspondence. Acts xv, 23—29, which is the oldest New Testament document that has come down to us, uses nearly the same simple formula. First we have the official titles of the writers: "the apostles" etc., their gospel address, "brethren," then the geographical bounds within which "the decrees" were to be received; next the evangelical title of those greeted: "to the brethren," and their ethenic origin, "of the Gentiles;" and then the salutation, "Greeting." We discover here already traces of that new life which is so characteristic of the religion of Christ. It touched everything, and *quod tetigit ornavit*. In this earliest ecclesiastical greeting, the Gospel is represented in the first part—by "apostle," "elder," and "brother;" and in the second part—by "brother" and "Gentiles," old words with new meanings—the whole salutation retaining unaltered only the *χαίρετε*. In the course of time, this last part was destined, as it was capacitated, to undergo the greatest and most marked change. James used it in his catholic epistle, and true to his

*The following dispatch from Cæsar to Quintus Cicero, when he was besieged by the Gauls, in extremity, contains a greeting too urgent even for the salutation: "Cæsar to Cicero: Expect help."

conservative position, was the last to use it. Thenceforth the old bottle was broken, and the new wine of the kingdom was put into new bottles, (Matt. ix, 17).—Peter and John, and even Jude, employ a newer and more enlarged form. The old *χαίρειν* is multiplied and ennobled, and becomes: *χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη*, and *ἀγάπη*. A miracle passes upon the word, and the compliments of the world—weak as water, are changed into the strengthening wine of the church.

In discussing the subject of Paul's Greetings, we shall consider it under the following three divisions:

I. THE PERSON OR PERSONS GREETING.

II. THE PERSON OR PERSONS GREETED.

III. THE WORDS OF THE GREETING ITSELF.

I. *The Person or Persons sending the Congratulation.*

Nothing can be less mechanical than the structure of these brief salutations. Though in their brevity and frequent recurrence, there lay a strong tendency to unmeaning uniformity yet each one, in some casual feature, bears the impress of the peculiar circumstances under which the epistle, to which it is prefixed, was written, and thus offers an incidental, but additional and racy proof of the genuineness of the epistle. In those introducing the epistles to the Thessalonians, Paul does not even claim the honor or the authority of the apostleship. And why should he? His foot-prints had hardly yet grown cold in their synagogue, while of the "devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few," (Acts xvii, 4)—were signs of an apostleship, (II. Cor. xii, 12)—that could not be gainsayed. Hence he co-ordinates Silas and Timothy with him in authority, as they had been equals in labor and sufferings (Acts xvi). Perhaps, however, his apostolate had not yet been impeached, or if it had been, the report had not yet reached him, in his abundant and itinerant labors. The adjuration in I. Thess. v. 27—implies that he knew himself possessed of such authority; and in the second letter, the omission of the apostolic claim in the greeting, may be considered as fully supplemented by the autograph salutation, (iii, 17)—to

which he directs their special attention ; for in that it is implied that he claimed inspired authority for his letters, and that it was accorded to him by the churches—they needing only his sign-manual to attest their genuineness, (Rom. xvi, 22, I. Cor. xvi, 21, Col. iv, 18, and Gal. vi, 11). In I. & II. Cor. especially in Galatians, where he is careful to put forth his apostolic authority decidedly and even polemically, he embalms the dear names of Sosthenes (I. Cor. i, 1,) and Timothy (II. Cor. i, 1,) and a circle of other fellow-laborers too large to be named, (Gal. i, 2)—in the greeting, delighting too much in their *gospel-fellowship* to deny them the privilege of the brotherhood, though they could not claim the honors of the Apostleship. In the opening words to the Philippians he modestly (and perhaps also because the controversy touching his apostolical authority, was now already [A.D. 64] ten or twelve years past) omits "apostle," and joins with him Timothy in the equal yoke of "servants of Jesus Christ." Does not this greeting tacitly confess "the parity of the clergy?" The *doulos* was technically "a minister," (Col. iv, 18). It always designated this office when used in its proper sense, and when qualified by "Christ," "Jesus Christ," or "Lord," (2 Tim. ii, 24). "Servant of God" is an Old Testament phrase, and may mean merely a believer, (Rev. vii 3, I. Pet. ii, 16); and Jude, and James, true to their Judaistic leanings, use only "servants" in their greetings, while Peter (II. i, 1,) defines his use of "servant" by *καὶ ἀπόστολος, καὶ* being exegetical as well as connective. It may be remarked in passing, that Jude and James in the choice of *δοῦλος* in their greetings, and particularly in the order of their words, show that they lived in the quiet and unimpeached claim and exercise of their apostolic functions. (John does not assert his apostleship, he is simply "the presbyter"). This exemption they may have owed to their connexion with the original apostolic college, to which Paul was added, if added at all, as *Apostolus extraordinarius*, the legitimacy of whose succession was the very question at issue between him and the opponents of his apostolate. James and Jude in their greetings made prominent the *source* of their office,

Paul the office itself. He magnified his *office*, (Rom. xi. 13.) They put forward the divine side of their sacred character, Paul (Peter too, after he was "converted" from his Jewish leanings, Gal. ii. 12,) the human side. They were "servants of God," and of "Jesus Christ," while Paul was generally "the apostle of Christ Jesus." The very order of their words shows their religious bias; Paul is the apostle of Christ to the Gentiles, Peter and James and Jude, the servants of God to the Jews.

As another illustration of this unstudied variety, what could be more touching, and characteristic of the great apostle, than to greet Philemon with "prisoner," rather than "apostle;" for was Paul not then wearing out the last years of old age (verse 9) in a dungeon, (Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1, II. Tim. i. 8,) for that very gospel which was the burden of his labors and letters—and yet see the modesty of this chief servant of God! He is not the apostle, nor the servant, nor even the prisoner, he stands not on the article. Others were apostles, others were servants, and others were prisoners—and how ungrudging, in this matter, towards Timothy, Sosthenes, and Titus—each of these is "the brother." A truly Pauline magnanimity!

This freedom of treatment is not confined to the first part of the greetings, that in which the writer was handling merely the broader features of his office, but in the discussion of the modes of authorization, as well as in the claim of the authority itself, Paul allows himself the same liberty. It is unconscious liberty, and expresses itself with all the variety of spontaneous utterance,—an utterance determined, not by the recollection of his previous language, but by the pressure of present feelings. In affirming his apostolical authority, "by the will of God" is the predominant form (I and II Cor. Eph. Col. and II Tim.), but not the exclusive one. There is a regular, and definable gradation in the claim which he asserts, rising from its unsurpassed but tacit assumption in I and II Thess., Philippians and Philemon, till it reaches its acme. This ascension is not however in the chronological order of the Epistles. It culminates in the Epistle to the Galatians; and the letters which fall within

that epoch (I and II Cor. 1 Tim. and Romans,) in an ascending and descending scale, give evidence, in their greetings, of the strong agitation which wrought in the mind of the apostle on this subject. "By the will of God" is the mildest as well as the commonest verbal form in which the apostolic claim could be asserted. To this generic claim of divine authority, other terms were added for definiteness, according to circumstances. *Κλητός* (Rom. i, 1, 1 Cor. i.) adds a firmer as well as clearer tone to "apostle." It brings before his readers the specific fact and manner of his "ordination." As one "born out of due time" (I Cor. xv, 8, the apostolic college having been completed), he needed a special act of incorporation, and this act is referred to in the word "called" (Gal. i, 15 explained by Luke's account Acts ix, 3—22, compared with Paul's—Acts xxii 1—21, and xxvi, 11—20). The anarthous form of *κλητός* both in Rom. and I Cor. also favors this interpretation. We cannot help noting another co-incident and confirmatory fact. So far as the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians are concerned, their dates of composition were not very wide apart, the contents are so strikingly accordant in subject and treatment, that except in their relative sizes, they almost necessarily recall those other twin epistles Ephesians and Colossians; and, in no feature, is their resemblance stronger than in their greetings. The dogmatic character of both these greetings we pass by, for the present, looking merely at that part which has reference to the apostleship. In Romans, which is irenic, all the terms in which the apostolate is claimed and defined, follow quietly in their order, from the most generic word "Servant of Jesus Christ," while in Galatians, the apostle *begins* as usual, but no sooner has he dictated *ἀπόστολος*, than his wounded and indignant soul turns on his oppugners, and through nearly two chapters he vindicates his gospel and his gospel ministry. *There is nothing grander on record than this vindication*; Paul against "the disturbers" (Acts ii 4), a class of theological busybodies born out of the conflicting elements of the old and waning Judaism, and the new and growing Christianity. It was these very men that had created the necessity for the

council at Jerusalem (A. D. 50,) where they seem already to have been known by this technical term, nor is their origin left to conjecture (Acts xv, 24), "from us." During the ten or twelve years previous to the council, they had been "disturbing" the young churches, and during the five years following, —their staple argument being Paul's unapostolic character. With this insinuation they entered every church, which Paul had planted in the synagogues, and taking advantage of the still remaining Jewish prejudices and predilections, were seeking to annul or pervert his labors. What! had he been running, and was he still running, on an unauthorized mission (Gal. ii, 2). Must he renounce the missionary labors of half a life-time as unapostolic? Is his consciousness of the interview with the crucified, risen and glorified Saviour, on the plains of Damascus (Acts ix 7 "no one,") henceforth to be a delusion? Are his labors at Damascus (Gal. i, 17), in Arabia, and in his native country and Syria (Gal. i, 21), to be accounted fanatical? And those years of suffering, conflict and agony so feelingly summarized in II Cor. xi, 23-28,—"afflictions" the memory of which still burned in his soul, after ten years more of toil and trouble glimmered even in the darkness of his prison (II Tim. iii, 10, 11), must all these years be obliterated from the record of his ministry, as of one offering strange fire? And those dear converts, who were found by thousands along the lines of his missionary tours, through the Isle of Cyprus and the cities of Pisidia, Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe—were they all churches without bishops? And the believers in Philippi, and Thessalonica, and Berea, and Athens, and Corinth, and Ephesus, had they all received the word and sacraments from uncanonical hands?—having listened, not merely to a layman, but forsooth to a madman? Confirmed, not by an apostle, but an apostate? Yes, this was what those "disturbers" were seeking to accomplish, and the conduct of some of his own converts showed plainly, that their perverters had succeeded only too well. No wonder the very opening of the first Epistle (Galatians,) in which he was compelled to vindicate his high office, is so perturbed in its structure, so adversative in

its particles. The apostle does not so much reason, as resent. He pours out his convictions unanalyzed, and only after awhile does the torrent of argument run clear enough to reveal the outward facts on which he seeks to convict the enemy of falsehood. They denied his apostleship,—and so distinctly does the falseness of this charge lie in his own experience, that no sooner has he uttered the word “apostle” than he pours forth the rebutting testimony of his consciousness: “not from men, nor by man, but—” They charged that theirs was the true gospel,—and so intense is his conviction of the damnable fraud, that no sooner does he write “gospel” than he spurns the idea of “another gospel.” It was no gospel at all, only (*εἰ μὴ*) the forgery of notorious agitators. They pretended that his gospel was “after man”, and quicker than thought, quick as feeling, comes the rebuff. *Οὐδὲ* is at once succeeded by *οὐτε*, and both by *ἀλλὰ* (v. 12.) After this first outburst of indignation, the relieved spirit begins to reason in detail, through a long induction ending with the second chapter. But even then, again and again the heart comes uppermost, and the logic is inflamed. The use of “then” (ii. 1), and kindred terms expressive of time, duration and succession, is quite in contrast with the ardent, overflowing, and emotional utterances which belong to the first chapter; but the very sharpness of the contrast, between this impassioned language of the Apostle, and these cool dialectic terms of time, place and circumstance, reveals the grand equipoise of his mind—so ardent, yet so logical, so impulsive, yet so methodical. Witness the minute and compact consecutiveness of the statement beginning ch. i 17 and ending ii, 1. He did not go to Jerusalem, (*ἀλλὰ*, Paul’s favorite adversative particle) but to Arabia; nor on his return from Arabia, was it to Jerusalem, but *again* to Damascus. *Then* after three years, he went up to Jerusalem, and was with Peter “of the circumcision” (ii 7,) the friend of these men (ii. 12), but only fifteen days; also saw James, the brother of the Lord, very probably the Apostle, and certainly also in sympathy, doctrinally, with these same men (ii, 12); *then* came to Syria, and Cilicia, *then, after fourteen years*, went again to Jerusalem. These details are as precise,

and as consecutive, and as local, as if they made part of an affidavit, and were to be scrutinized by the opposing counsel. It is in one of the peaceful eddies of this remittent stream of anger and argument, that we first find two notes of Paul's apostleship, notes which, according to the usual structure of the greeting, we should have had in the first verse, but which in this abrupt and disturbed epistle, we do not get till in the 15th v. (comp. Rom. i, 1, I Cor. i, 1). By carrying these back to the beginning of the Epistle, we see how strong is the resemblance, in the salutatory feature, between Romans and Galatians.

It remains to notice one other expression used by Paul in asserting his apostolic character. In greeting Timothy, in his first epistle, he calls himself an apostle of Christ Jesus "by the commandment (*ἐπιταγήν*) of God." This phrase is not an equivalent of "by the will of God". It marks the imperative volition of God, instead of the immanent purpose; it is, therefore, specific rather than generic, and authenticating in the highest degree. The phrase in I Tim. i, 1, might be translated adverbially, and would thus convey accurately the force: "authoritatively appointed an apostle of Christ, by God" (vid. I Cor. vii, 16, 2 Cor. viii, 8. Gal. i, 11). In Titus i, 3, he uses the same expression. Here, following the same principle of translation, we would read: "which was authoritatively entrusted to me by my Saviour God." "By the command of God" expresses the same generic idea that is conveyed by "called;" both are species of the "by the will of God," but "called" refers more to the phenomena attending and evincing the divine appointment, while the "command" rather designates the immediate cause of those phenomena. The former marks the human side, and the latter the divine, of the apostolic call. The one sets forth the objective proofs of his apostleship, proofs which others could see and feel; such as accompanied his conversion (Acts, ix. 3—22), and also, such as attended his ministry (II Cor. xii. 12); the other, the subjective evidence of his apostolic authority—his consciousness of communion with God when called, and of communication

with him afterwards (I Cor. vii, 6, 25. II Cor. viii, 8. Gal. ii, 2).

In looking at the whole body of Paul's correspondence, in the light of the first member of the greeting, we recognize the following divisions, and subdivisions. *First*: (A) those letters, in which he puts forth no claim to apostolic authority, viz: I and II Thess. Phil. and Philemon. So far these letters resemble the epistles of James, John and Jude. *Second*: (B.) those in which the apostleship is claimed—which includes all the remaining epistles. This second class divides itself into two sub-classes. Those (a.) in which the claim is made in a *higher* degree: e. g. I Cor. (?), Titus, I Tim., Rom. and Galatians; and those (b.) which assert it in a lower degree: e. g. II Cor., Eph., Col. and II Timothy. In this latter class, the Epistles of Peter may be reckoned. In respect to those letters which insist on the apostolate, it is difficult to exclude the belief that the dates of their composition must fall within a comparatively short period. This chronology would favor the scheme of Wieseler, so far as it draws I Tim. and Titus within the whole second sub-class, viz: II Cor., Eph., Col., and II Timothy. While there are other facts which favor this view, we still feel that entirely too many difficulties environ the time-table of Paul's correspondence to admit of dogmatism.

It only remains to consider a few things connected with (A.) and (b.). In I and II Thess., Paul does not assert, or even mention, his apostolic office. This omission is sufficiently accounted for by saying, that it had not yet been impeached. But why omit the mention of it in his letter to Philemon, when in the synchronistic letters to the Eph. and Col. the dignity is claimed, and its source asserted? We answer—The letter to Philemon was an official letter to be sure, but it was addressed to an un-official person (?), and a personal acquaintance, and hence there was no need of asserting apostolic authority, though he might have done it (verse 8). But why then is the claim made, and definitely too, in I and II Timothy and Titus? They were personal acquaintances.

We reply : these letters were official, and were addressed to officials, and just such officers ("evangelists" II Tim. 4, 5) itinerant missionaries, or missionary bishops), as might need the apostolic seals, and hence they were affixed. Nor is this additional reason improbable. If Paul was accustomed to reflect his temporary moods of joy (Philippians), of indignation and sorrow (Galatians), and of rapture (Ephesians), from the general surface of his epistles, shall we not expect to find traces of the same subjective states, even in the very greetings? Indeed we have them unmistakably in Gal. i. 1, and in Philemon and the pastoral letters. How natural, then, that sitting in the dampness, and darkness of the Mamertini,—sick and old, something of the gloom of the dungeon should invade his own soul, and cloud for the time the clear consciousness of his apostolic authority! Many had forsaken, or left him (II Tim. i. 15; iv. 10, 16)—only Luke remained at his side. Had God forgotten him too, as David felt he had him (Ps. xxii. 1, 2)? Or was he in the cloud with his Master (Matt. xxvii. 46)? as we all are at times, when in our crucifixion with Christ, (Gal. ii 20), we are filling up that which is behind of his afflictions, (Col. i, 24). Not at all (II Tim. iv, 17.)—but a cloud was over him, and, as if speaking rather to re-assure himself than Timothy, he begins his letter: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God," etc., (Tit. i, 3.)—for did he not recall the very words of Christ (Acts xxii. 21.)? In the second Epistle to Timothy, he relapses again into the more general form "by the will of God."

But Philippians yet remains an exception. Why has it no words expressive of apostolic dignity? Had that controversy, begun in Gal. A. D. 54, now, A. D. 64, all passed over, leaving Paul in undisputed possession of his apostolic office and authority? If we were sure about the chronology of these letters, we could tell just how much weight to attach to this question; but uncertainty here makes it necessary to look for another solution,—one that is not affected by the question of date. The Epistle to the Philippians is *sui gene-*

ris. It is not a doctrinal treatise, like Romans; nor apologetico-doctrinal, like Galatians; nor strongly christological, like Eph. and Colosians; nor ethico-practical, like I and II Cor. Nor does it treat of eschatology, like I and II Thessalonians. It bears some resemblance to Philemon,—as much as a letter to many can resemble a letter to one. It has a private air about it, (vid. iv, 2, 3,) and sounds like an affectionate conversation with a circle of the dearest friends,—and friends who had been unceasing benefactors, and such it is. *It was a letter of thanks*; the most joyful letter in his inspired port-folio. In the frequent and formal acknowledgements of the kindness of the Philippians (ii, 25, 30; iv, 10, 14—19,) it is a file of receipts. We hardly look for the broad seal of an apostle to such a letter. Certainly this active foreign missionary church (iv, 15—17,) did not need it. Did those “women which resorted” to that extra-mural oratory, need it? Did Lydia their hostess need it? Did the Jailer need it? I trow not—and so the great apostle of the Gentiles simply calls himself, and Timothy with him, “servants of Jesus Christ.” Before leaving this part of the subject, let us turn to the Epistle to Titus. This is the only greeting in which Paul used the Jewish phrase “servant of God,” (James i, 1 joins “God,” and “the Lord Jesus Christ” to qualify “servant,” but gives “God,” the place of honor). Was this a piece of courtesy having reference to the matter mentioned Gal. ii, 3? The Jewish converts, or perhaps rather the Judaizing teachers, had strongly insisted on the circumcising of Titus; but Greek that he was, the Apostolic college did not demand that Titus should be circumcised. So Paul gained his case, and having brought off victoriously a free Gospel, and therefore a universal one, he now graciously writes himself: first “servant of God,” giving precedence to the Jewish view of his office, and so teaching Titus a lesson of charity; then he proceeds: *ἀπόστολος δὲ* (not *ἀλλὰ*)—*δὲ* expresses difference, but *ἀλλὰ* a contrast and opposition, and all he wished to say was—I honor these Judaistic leanings, so far as they simply express affection for the old dispensation; but I

did not then (Gal. ii, 5,) nor do I now, give way to any attempt to remit the church to its former state of pupilage, and consequent bondage. I am God's servant, as was Moses (Rev. xv, 3); but I am by authority (verse 3), *also* an apostle of Jesus Christ.

There is a slight feature interposed between the first and second parts of most of the greetings, which is worthy of a brief notice. In all of the epistles addressed to Christian communities, with the exception of Romans and Ephesians, Paul joins with himself one or more fellow-laborers. In I and II Thess. we have Silvanus (Silas) and Timothy. The former appears early in the Gospel history. Acts xv., 22 mentions him as one of those selected by the council to carry and interpret the decrees (v. 27) of that body to the Gentile churches. Then already he was "a chief man among the brethren," and a teacher (v. 32 "prophet.") Both he (II Cor. i., 19) and Timothy (Acts xvi., 2) were with the apostle in his second missionary tour, during which the letters to the Thessalonians were written. How natural to insert these names in these epistles. Were they not all collegiate pastors in that church? For a similar reason, we find Sosthenes "the chief ruler of the synagogue" at Corinth, allied with the apostle, in his first letter to that church. (Acts xviii., 17, I Cor. i. 1.) Whose name would be so influential, and so pleasant to the Corinthian believers among the Jewish converts, as the former president of their synagogue. But it is Timothy that appears as another self—but younger. From his conversion, during Paul's first missionary tour (Acts xvi., 2) till the end of the apostle's life (II Tim. iv., 6 "ready to be offered," on the point of leaving this world) Timothy was with, or near him, and when, I and II Thess., II Cor., Rom. (xvi., 21) Eph., Col., Philemon and Philip: were written, this *true son* (I Tim. i., 2 cf. Phil. iv., 3) of the faith was counted worthy of a seat by the Apostle's side, leaning on his bosom as John had leaned on the bosom of his master. It is David and Jonathan translated into the New Testament. To whom should he commit his dying testimony (II Tim. iv., 6-8) if not to his dearly beloved son, (II Tim. i., 2), his only

"like minded" man (Phil. ii., 20). In the Epistles of none of the other writers, (unless we except I Pet. v., 12) do we find this trait of fellowship and friendship. Only Paul, whom current tradition makes so stern, had his many gospel friends and loved to embalm their names.

II. The Person or Persons Greeted.

The parties to whom the greetings were sent were either communities or individuals. Sometimes these "churches" were limited to cities, but generally the Christian communities greeted embraced whole territories. Though it is natural to look for a tame uniformity in the arrangement of so few materials, especially when these materials were restricted to the names of the individuals or churches to whom the letters were addressed, yet to an earnest soul nothing is formal, and when, therefore, Paul took his pen to counsel, admonish, or comfort his converts, they came before him in their separate characters—their characters as professed followers of Christ, and to greet them all alike would be only less in conflict with the Apostle's feelings, than it would have been to distribute the epistles themselves indiscriminately. The character of the greeted permeates the *whole* letter, because that character was the cause of the letter's being sent. Hence the greeting contains the key-note of the Eolian strain that follows. "The churches of Galatia" never could compare the greeting in Paul's epistle to them, with the greeting contained in his letter to the Colossians, and not feel that they stood in different relations to the writer. The latter were "saints and faithful brethren in Christ," in the very outset of the letter, because their brotherly conduct and charity were uppermost in his heart, when he began to write to them; but when he is constrained to write to the Galatians, every severer thought lay on the top of his heart, and only deep down, under many unpleasant reports, and anxious fears, was buried the paternal feeling—sure to come out, because it was there, but not appearing until he had first drawn off the forestalling suspicions, and reproofs, and rebukes. The foam of Niagara floats far out on the lake, flecking every headland on its way; but, at last,

all trace of even its mighty agony is lost in the placid bosom of Ontario : so the heart of Paul, in its conflicts with his enemies, and the enemies of Christ, because of the Galatians, carries flakes of foam down the whole stream of the Epistle—checkering its surface all along, yet at last it sinks to repose in the expiring murmur—"brethren," and when he seals it with "Amen," all is peace.

Paul addresses the Thessalonians as "the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (I and II Thess. i., 1). This description of a church by means of an adjective, instead of a local noun with a preposition, is found only here, and in the salutation of the Epistle to the Colossians (iv., 16) where the church at Laodicea is addressed in the same manner ; and this style is repeated of this church (Rev. iii., 14—though this passage, as well as Rev. ii, 8, of the Smyrnes church are impeached). The spiritual character of the church is, however, clearly set forth by the phrase "in God," which restricts the "meeting" to those Thessalonians who, by faith, were *in* God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. In the second epistle God is called our "Father," making God the *Father* of believers, and so, in the spirit of "the Lord's prayer," giving a strong New Testament coloring to the first person of the Trinity. (Rom. viii, 15. Gal. iv, 6.) This is one of those weighty pronouns, (and there are more of them introduced into the third member of the greeting,) by which the huge and heavy mountain of Jewish prejudice was broken to pieces, (Jno. v., 17, 18). There is no mistaking the sad significance of the simple phrase "to the churches of Galatia," in the letter to the Galatians. The customary evangelical predicate is intentionally withheld. How could he honestly write otherwise, when his heart was still full of fear lest all his labor among them had been in vain, (Gal. iv., 11) ; when he was travelling with their second birth (v., 19) ; and while he was yet all perplexed about their conduct and character ? There was no room for brotherly affection to spring up in that perturbed breast. If now we turn to the first epistle to the Corinthians we are at once struck with the fulness of this part of

the salutation. The letter is addressed "to the church of God which is in Corinth," (the same in II. Cor. i., 1); there the members are spoken of as "sanctified in Christ." Christ is the sphere in which their sanctification had taken place, and in which it now consists. The choice of *en* rather than *dia* is not accidental, for the Apostle had heard bad news concerning these Corinthian christians (i., 11). They excelled in many excellent things (v., 57), but their party spirit, their bigotry, their sectarianism, and the consequent strife and bitterness, filled Paul with a sorrow so large that we see its shadow in the very opening of this letter. Was not Christ one, and were they not all *in* him? Separated from the world and segregated with one another "in Christ?" He will not recognize their divisions, he will not know anything among them save Jesus Christ and Him crucified (ii. 2); hence passing by their party names he writes: "with all who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." For He was the common property of *all* of the saints, and not the *peculium* of any of the self-constituted factions. It was *our* Lord, to whom they prayed, not *theirs*. "With all," etc.—because he was writing to them as *in* Christ and not as those who *professed* Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or Christ, and so mutually excluded one another. If anything within the narrow limits of a greeting could enhance the force of Paul's appeal for unity, it would be the reciprocal and equipollent pronouns "theirs" and "ours" in the last clause. Not only is Christ *our* Lord, but both *theirs* and *ours*. The thirteenth chapter of this Epistle is only an illuminated copy of the "charity" implied and urged in those pronouns and the other particles ("in" and "with") set into this greeting. In the second Epistle to the Corinthians, the greeting is less full on the subject of unity. "With all" is still retained, and perhaps additional emphasis lies in the position assigned to *πᾶσι*—with *τοῖς* repeated after *τοῖς ἁγίοις*. If this interpretation is correct, then it is reasonable to infer that all the churches, in that region of country of which Corinth was the centre, had been infected with the same spirit of contention, which raged in the democratic and heterogeneous metropolis. This

being so, the Apostle raised the standard of peace over the whole province of Achaia.

In passing from the first group of letters to the second, embracing Romans, Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians, we at once miss the familiar word, *ecclesia*, and in its place find simply the ecclesiastical terms, "saints" and "faithful," which had been used to explain and adapt it to its new application. Why not a letter to the church in Rome? Was there no church there, as well as in Corinth (I and II Cor. i.)? There were, in both cities, those who were "called to be saints," (Rom. i, 7, cf. I Cor. i, 2; II Cor. i, 1,) and there were moreover household churches in the imperial city, at the date of this letter (Rom. xvi, 5, 10, 11,) besides "bands" of believers (*vs.* 14, 15,) which if not *ecclesia* were at least *ecclesiolae*. Certain it is there was as yet no church of Rome. Was the exclusion of *ecclesia* in the greeting secured by that wonderful provision of the Spirit, which so carefully put "all" into the administration of "the cup," while it was omitted from the distribution of "the bread?"—"the Scriptures foreseeing" (Gal. iii, 8,) that this word would be wrested to men's destruction! "Beloved of God" (verse 7) is peculiar to this place. What does it reflect? His joy and gratitude that their faith was world-renowned (Rom. i, 9)? or was it the natural expression of his long-deferred desire to visit them—time and distance lending enchantment to his contemplation of their graces, (*vs.* 10—13)? Either of these would be sufficient to account for this loving and sanctified epithet. Or was it because so many of his friends, kindred, converts, and fellow-laborers had drifted to the world's capital? We think the latter is the reason. The sixteenth chapter shows how much of his earthly treasure was there, and where else upon the earth should his heart be? Is this too human a view of the forces which wrought in Paul's mind? We think not. It has been shown in another place what large concessions, in this respect, were made to him, and to his prototype—the Psalmist.* In Ephesians i, 1, the abnormal position of "in

**Evangelical Quarterly Review*, April, 1863, on the "Salutations of Paul."

Ephesus" between "Saints" and "faithful," thrusting a local term between two co-ordinate and homogeneous ideas, thus dislocating the greeting, is a strong presumption against its genuineness, and this suspicion is strengthened by the fact of the omission of co-salutors found in all the other church-letters (Romans is not an exception, see xvi, 21,) and also the absence of all salutations at the end,—both these marks being found in the synchronistic epistles, Colossians and Philemon. Was this then an encyclical letter? We should say "yes," at once, were it not for vi, 21, 22, cf. Col. iv, 7, 8. A local letter would naturally contain such a charge, but hardly a circular one. The christological character of Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians (especially that salient passage ii, 5—11,) is distinctly foreshadowed by the "in Christ" (Col. i, 1) and "in Christ Jesus" (Eph. i, 1, and Phil. i, 1). The Epistle to the Philippians has one peculiarity in this member of the greeting, which is quite noticeable. After congratulating this favorite church of his first planting in Europe, with the same word "holy" which is used in Rom., I and II Cor., Eph. and Col., he goes on to specify the officers of the church, "bishops" and "deacons." There was doubtless a special reason then operating on the Apostle's mind for appending the officers of that church to his customary salutation. It was not because that was the only church in which these offices existed, for "deacons" were of early standing, in the primitive church, (Acts vi, 1—6); and "bishops" too were in other churches (Acts xx, 17, 28). *We look in vain, in the body of the Epis-

*It is noteworthy that here only the two "orders" (Protestant) are recognized—Bishops and Deacons, and that this church, as also the church at Ephesus (Acts xx, 28), had no less a plurality of bishops than of deacons. If we take *episcopos* as the equivalent of "bishop," then there was no "priest" in the Philippian church; and if we make it equal to "priest," then there were no "bishop" there. We know from Scripture (Acts xx, 17, 28), and from Jerome (*Apud veteres iidem episcopi et presbyteri*), that *episcopos* and *presbyteros*, were the same officer, "*illud*," says Jerome, "*nomina dignitatis est, hoc aetatis*," and we also know that "presbyter" is "priest writ large." Bishops were never set over churches by the Holy Ghost, as our version unfortunately and injuriously translates (Vulg.: *in quo posuit*, Arabic: *in quo constituit*, Ethiop.: *in quem constituit*). They were to take heed to themselves and the whole flock "in which" ("in"

tle, for the solution, nor does light come to us from the dim record in Acts. The answer must be adjourned, but still we thank Paul for putting these honored words into this greeting—"The minister" and "his deacon"; not only because it continues the pleasing and natural variety, but because it shows that, if there was no local church without its bishops, (in those days it was a plurality of bishops, and not, as now, a plurality of benefices, that was accounted apostolical), it was the church that held the "bishops and deacons," and not the bishops and deacons that constituted the church.

In this second member of the greetings we see also the recognition of the composite character of the first churches. They were made up of Gentiles and Jews—the new and the renewed. And there is preserved the same divine order in their mention that there was in their election (Rom. i, 16. ii, 10), the Jew first and then the Gentile. The Apostle always greets the Christian community as "saints" before he speaks of them as "believers." The former term is redolent of Jewish associations, while the latter is characteristically ethnic and evangelical (Eph. and Philip. and Col.). When the address is varied as in I and II Corinthians, "of God" takes precedence to the exclusion of "Christ" (Rom. xvi. 16.), but still recognizing, in the next clause, Christ as the substratum ("in Christ") of their "holiness" so that "called to be saints" clearly includes "the church of God," and "the sanctified in Christ." In I II Thess. where we have still another form of words, "in God the Father" comes before "the Lord Jesus Christ." The Epistle to the Romans appears at first sight to be an exception. But the "called to be saints" (e. g. Rom. i, 7), is a com-

marking the sphere of the pastoral work), in the midst of which, the Holy Ghost has "set" you as bishops. So in I Peter v, 2 the co-presbyters of Peter are exhorted "to feed the flock" in whose midst, (*Vulgate: qui traditus est vobis*; Arab.: *qui inter vos est*; Eth.: *qui est apud vos*—not over whom) they are, taking the "care and cure" of them. Ruling over the church—domineering, as Peter calls it (II Peter v, 3), he discountenances, and his Master, before him, strictly forbade it: Matt. xx, 25, 26. *It was heathenish.* Nor should it be overlooked, that none of the Epistles—of Paul, John, Jude, James or Peter, were addressed to officers of the churches, but to the congregations themselves.

mon term, embracing both the Old and New Testament sides of sanctity. "Holy" is contrasted with "faithful," but "called" refers to Christ as the source of holiness: hence "called to be holy" is inclusive of both ideas, Jewish sanctity and Christian faith (I Cor. i, 2.), and therefore we are justified in regarding the phrase as in contrast with the Gentile side, "beloved of God" "called to be saints" cf.—thus giving here too the normal order, (compare Rom. i, 2 with verse 4, and especially verse 6.). The real exception to this rule is found in Galatians. "The churches of Galatia" is the undefined, but not indefinite salutation. There truly and bitterly there was neither Jew nor Greek, but only "foolish Galatians."

Another interesting feature of this part of the greeting is found in the sharp line of separation drawn between the church and the world. The Epistles were written to christians—real or professed, as we should say, "members of the church." These were the recipients as they were to be the depositaries of the truth. Unto them were committed "the lively oracles" of the new covenant, as unto the Jews had been committed the "lively oracles" of the old covenant (Rom. iii, 2). God has ever spoken only to the church—the church must speak through the interpretation of a godly life to the world (Matt. V, 16. Ps, ii, 13). See how exclusively ecclesiastical are the Epistles in their "address." It was not the assembly of Thessalonians that Paul greeted, but the assembly of Thessalonians "in God" etc. It was not Rome, the imperial city, that he admonished and to whom he sent his letter; but only to "the beloved of God" was the greeting directed. He does not address the inhabitants of Corinth, but only "the church of God" which was in that city, and when his scope is enlarged, in the second letter, it is still only "the saints" that are in his mind; and the same is true of the letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians. "The saints are his peculiar care." The only exception to the rule is here again that exceptional letter to the Galatians. Alas! *ecclesia** [meetings]

* It is a fair inference that, up to the time when the Epistle to the Galatians was written, *ecclesia* was not yet distinctively ecclesiastical. By de-

there were in the province of Galatia, but were they "churches of God" as in Corinth and Achaia; or churches of the Galatians in God" like the Thessalonians, or among the "churches of Christ" mentioned in Romans (xvi, 16)? That was the perplexing (Gal. iv, 20) query in Paul's mind. However there were "saints" in those churches, or were supposed to be, or we never should have had in the canon an Epistle "to the churches of Galatia." Is there not some counsel here as to whom "the word" is to be chiefly preached? In "*the Holy City*" stands the golden mile-stone from which "this way" is to be measured "unto the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts i, 8). The Jew first, then the Gentile (Matt. x, 5--6.); first the synagogue, then the forum (Acts xii 46);—when the saints are revived, then the dead are quickened. Is. lx 1—4.

The variety, which we found so vital and pleasing in the addresses to communities, does not leave Paul when he leaves them, and turns to individuals. His bias remains, and his honest heart still expressess itself. He greets all, but there is as much difference between his salutations addressed to the different individuals, as there was in his salutations to the different churches. In comparing his letters to the Romans and Galatians, though they are doctrinally so resemblant, how different their greetings! Could any intelligent reader see them transposed, and not feel that the exchange was almost robbery. To have put "beloved" into the first chapter of Galatians, and "foolish" into the third chapter, would have

grees as "this way" because broader and better known, "of God" (1 Thess. ii 14. II Thess. i, 4. Gal. i, 13. 1 Cor. i, 2. x 32. xi 16 22, xv 9. II Cor. i, 2,) "of Christ" (Rom. xvi, 16), "in God the Father" (I and II Thess.) and "in Christ" (Gal. i, 22) were added to distinguish church from town-meetings (Acts xix, 39). Then during a few years—perhaps the period in which the Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians were written, such words as "saints" and "believers" etc were used of these religious bodies, till finally the word *ecclesia*, which was first baptized with a Jewish and then a christian spirit, became again a technical term—now in a spiritual sense, as formerly it had been in a secular sense—and stood forth in Greek and Latin as designating "the body of Christ", so always used in Revelation, Ephesians, Col., except in a salutation sent to a household church [iv, 15.] invincible because immortal (Matt. viiii 16).

been more than irony or even sarcasm, it would have been hypocrisy. So, when we compare Philemon and Timothy with Titus, we feel that these brethren did not sustain the same relations to Paul. Timothy and Titus were both "own sons;" but Titus was only "a true (genuine) child" "in the common faith" of believers—a generic and objective idea; while Timothy is his genuine son "in the faith"—a more specific thought, and strongly subjective. Titus is addressed as related to, but Timothy as inhering in, the faith. When we look at Timothy i. and ii. 2, and Titus i. 4, we miss the pronoun (I. Cor. iv., 17) and the article—but in Philemon (1) we have the article. The former were official, and so far public—the latter was private and personal. Nor must we overlook the articles which distinguish and commend Apphia and Archippus (2).^{*} In the use of the article, Paul marks the difference of his personal feelings towards his friends, as, in the kiss, and the shaking of the hand, we mark ours. It is in this minute verbal integrity that we recognize the sincerity of the Apostle's character. The particles reveal the light and shade of his affections. Such a gradation of feelings belongs to the scale of love, whether it be the love of God for his children, of Christ for his disciples, or of Christians for each other. This difference of degree makes the variety of heaven, Paradise is full of flowers, but all have not the same fragrance. One star differeth from another star in glory, because it has pleased God to pour more light into its golden bowl. This sensitiveness of the Apostle's mind to the different characters of his personal friends, and of the churches to which his letters were addressed, becomes even more striking by contrast with the other apostles who have left letters. James addresses his Epistle "to the twelve tribes which are in the dispersion," and so also Peter, in his first letter, salutes his readers, "as elect sojourners of the dispersion

^{*} The Epistle to Philemon is anomalous in the greeting. While it is entitled "The Epistle to Philemon" it is a sort of circular letter, because Apphia and Archippus are as truly individualized in the address as Philemon, yet it is an individual letter to Philemon, because to him the subject-matter of the Epistle was addressed (verse 10, d. e.).

in Pontus, &c." In Peter's second epistle he, apparently with feeling, qualifies the "faith" by the phrase "like precious" (comp. Pet. i. 4) and so makes himself one of his readers. Nor does Jude come any nearer to his fellow-christians. But if they do not reveal their affections, they certainly do their religious bias, in the precedence which they give to the first person of the Trinity (I. Pet. i, 2. II. Pet. i, 1. Jude) "to them that are sanctified by God the Father and Jesus Christ." Compare I. Cor. i., 2 "Sanctified in Christ Jesus." John's first letter is without a greeting, like Hebrews; the second, to "an elect Lady;" and only the third "to the well beloved Gaius," resembles Paul's personal letters.

[To be continued.]

ART. IV.—REV. THOMAS BRAINERD, D.D.

BY REV. ALBERT BARNES,

DANIEL xii. 2, 3.—And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake—and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever.

They shine as stars here; constituting bright constellations shedding their radiance upon the earth. They are removed at death to shine in other spheres and worlds; shedding a brighter radiance there. To human view they seem to become extinct, as when a star in the sky seems to burn out, and to pass away forever. Those stars *may* pass away. The power that created them, and that made them so bright and beautiful, can as easily annihilate them; and, bright, and beaming, and beautiful as they are, they may have accomplished their purpose, and may have ceased to be. They are material; and they may perish. But it is not so with mind:—bright, beaming, illustrious mind. That does not die.

It is not lost. It does not cease to shine. It is removed to other worlds ; it does not die. It leaves the earth indeed ; it is withdrawn from human view ; but it is transferred to other realms, to shine with undimmed and increasing lustre forever.

There is a difference in the brightness of those minds, both here, and in the world above, as there is a difference in the brightness of the heavenly bodies. "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars ; for one star differeth from another star in glory." I. Cor. xv. 41. Those "stars" that God removes from earth to other spheres, shine with different brightness here, and will shine with different brightness forever. All that are "wise" will shine indeed "as the brightness of the firmament"—perhaps with collected radiance like the milky-way in the heavens, but they that "turn many to righteousness" will shine with particular and brighter lustre, as distinguished from others, forever and ever. All that are redeemed, all that in their appropriate spheres on earth, live to honor God, and to do good to men, will shine forever, but the brightest of those stars will be those who "turn many to righteousness." He who in another sphere of life, if a good man, would have shone brightly in the world above ; he who in other callings could have secured a place among those that shall shine forever and ever, will shine more brightly if he consecrates his life to the purpose of turning men to righteousness. He can make more of his own life ; he can make his influence radiate further over his own generation ; he can make it strike onward with more effectiveness, into the interminable future, than he could have done if his life, however brilliant and useful, had been spent on objects soon to pass away. Paul, as a christian man, if he had employed his eloquence in defence of liberty or violated rights, would have won and worn a bright crown among mortals, ‡ for Longinus places his name among the great orators of the world ; but Paul made more of his talents, and will wear a brighter crown, and will shine as a brighter star, from having employed his talents in

turning men to righteousness, than he could have done in the widest fields of secular usefulness, ambition, or glory.

The removal of a man of eminent usefulness from our world is not such a loss to the universe as the extinction of a bright star might be, or as the extinction of the soul would be. The earth is but an atom in the immensity of the vast domain over which God presides, and the widest sphere of labor and of usefulness here is inconceivably small as compared with that vast field in which the redeemed soul is to live and act forever. True it is a loss to earth, to friends, to the cause of truth, to the church, to a nation it may be, as if the soul had ceased to be. The mind sagacious to plan, to council, to execute, is withdrawn from earth; the lips eloquent in the cause of truth, are silent; the pastor is no longer in the pulpit, in the house of mourning, or by the bed-side of the sick:—he who guided the young, who warned the wicked, who strengthened the feeble, who comforted the sorrowful, who animated the desponding, is seen no more; he who brought the richness of his experience, and the maturity of his judgment to the aid of the great interests of truth and humanity, has passed away. Influence is of slow growth, and is of inestimable value in our world. It is that in a man's known talents, learning, character, experience, and position, on which a presumption is based that what he holds is true; that what he proposes is wise. When a man has reached the maturity of life, this is all that, in these respects, is the fruit of his experience—the growth of many years—and constitutes, in our world, the best inheritance of virtue and of truth. It is a protracted work to form such a character. Native talent, learning, discipline, conflict, toil, experience, moral worth, all enter with its formation; and when one of such a character is removed, another such slow process—the accumulation of many years—is necessary before it can be replaced. There is nothing more valuable in society than this; there is nothing more difficult to replace. A city burned may be built again. Soon the rubbish will be cleared away; the streets be widened and straitened; long lines of dwellings and warehous-

es rise from the ruins, and a busy population there again drive on the affairs of commerce, of manufacture, of trade. Fields visited with drought are soon fresh and green again. The hills and valleys are clothed with verdure and flocks, the grain falls before the reaper, and the wains groan heavily laden with sheaves. From the fields where armies have encamped or fought; where the harvest has been trodden down by passing and repassing legions, where the torch has made everything desolate, all traces of the war are soon removed; for trees are planted, and the harvests grow, and the earth is rendered fertile by blood, and the little mounds of earth which marked the place where brave men fell and died, are leveled also, and the plough passes over Marathon, and Waterloo, and Antietam, as it did before.

But though the useful man, the preacher, the pastor, the man of experience, the man of eloquence, is no more among the living, yet he is not lost to the universe, nor in a higher sphere, to the cause to which he devoted his life. There is an aggregate; a collection; a gain to the universe which constitutes *heaven*—for heaven is made up of all that is redeemed from earth. The results of all the wisdom, experience, and moral worth of earth are there, and what is gathered there will shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars forever and ever.

The Rev. Thomas Brainerd was born in Leyden, in Lewis County, in the State of New York, on the 17th of June, 1804. He belonged to the family of Brainerds rendered illustrious by the life and labors of David Brainerd, missionary to the Indians; a man known and honored in other lands as well as in our own, and to be known and honored as a man endowed with the true spirit of a martyr in all coming time. The ancestor of this entire family was a little boy who was brought from Exeter, in England, in 1649, named Daniel Brainerd. He came with the Wyllis' family, one of the most affluent and respectable in Harford, Connecticut, and remained in that family till he was twenty-one years of age.

At that age, he with twenty-seven others, young men of his

own age, went about thirty miles below Hartford, and selected for settlement, a tract of land twelve miles square, comprehending nearly equal portions on each side of the Connecticut river, and founded the town of Haddam. That poor boy, reared as a farmer, became a prosperous, an influential, and a very respectable man. He was the greatest landholder in Haddam; he aided in establishing the first church in Haddam; almost the first year of the settlement he was chosen as a deacon in the church, and "wisely laid the foundation of his family hopes in the fear of God." It is said that "at least thirty-three thousand persons in the United States have looked back to that long boy as the head of their family." His influence as a man; and as a Christian, has been deeply felt in each subsequent generation. Not a few of those descended from him have occupied a high position in the church and in the state.*

The father of Dr. Brainerd was a respectable farmer; a pious man; somewhat prone to depression of spirits; a man who trained his family in the fear of God. Of the early years of Dr. Brainerd, and of the exact training in the family, we have little direct knowledge. I have referred to his ancestors to show that he inherited some of the best blood which has gone into the formation of the New England character, and with a view of explaining, in some measure, what his own subsequent life was, for much of that same spirit which actuated the founder of the family, and which has distinguished the family in its various branches, entered into his own character.

In respect to his own early training, I cannot be wrong in supposing that his account, in his life of John Brainerd, of the ordinary course of training in the family of the Brainerds, in accordance with the general course of family discipline in New England, was derived from what occurred substantially in his own father's house. At any rate, his own subsequent character and life can be best explained on the supposition that

* Life of John Brainerd, pp. 24-30.

this was the kind of training under which he was reared. As the account in itself is instructive; as it may be presumed that it expressed his own views on the subject of the discipline of a family; and as I think it cannot but be useful to bring it before the congregation in this form at this time, I will copy a portion of the description.

We had enforced on us in early life, with too little effect, we fear, many of the principles which formed the characters of David and John Brainerd one hundred and fifty years ago.

A boy was early taught a profound respect for his parents, teachers, and guardians, and implicit, prompt obedience. If he undertook to rebel, his will was broken by persistent and adequate punishment. He was accustomed every morning and evening to bow at the family altar; and the Bible was his ordinary reading-book in school. He was never allowed to close his eyes in sleep without prayer on his pillow.

"At a sufficient age, no caprice, slight illness, or any condition of roads or weather, was allowed to detain him from church. In the sanctuary he was required to be grave, strictly attentive, and able on his return at least to give the text. From sundown Saturday evening until the Sabbath sunset, his sports were all suspended, and all secular reading laid aside, while the Bible, the New England Primer, Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, Baxter's Saint's Rest, &c., were commended to his ready attention and cheerfully pored over.

"He was taught that his blessings were abundant and undeserved, his evils relatively few and merited, and that he was not only bound to contentment, but gratitude. He was taught that time was a talent to be always improved; that industry was a cardinal virtue, and laziness the worst form of original sin. Hence he must rise early, and make himself useful before he went to school; must be diligent there in study, and be promptly home to do 'chores' at evening. His whole time out of school must be filled up by some service—such as bringing in fuel for the day, cutting potatoes for the sheep, feeding the swine, watering the horses, picking the berries, gathering the vegetables, spooling the yarn, and running all

errands. He was expected never to be reluctant, and not often tired.

"He was taught that it was a sin to find fault with his meals, his apparel, his tasks, or his lot in life. Labor he was not allowed to regard as a burden, nor abstinence from any improper indulgence as a hardship. His clothes, woolen and linen, for summer and winter, were mostly spun, woven, and made up by his mother and sisters at home; and, as he saw the whole laborious process of their fabrication, he was jubilant and grateful for two suits, with bright buttons, a year. Rents were carefully closed and holes patched in the 'every day' dress, and the Sabbath dress always kept new and fresh.

"He was expected early to have the 'stops and marks,' the 'abbreviations,' the 'multiplication table,' the 'ten commandments,' the 'Lord's Prayer,' and the 'Shorter Catechism,' at his tongue's end.

"Courtesy was enjoined as a duty. He must be silent among his superiors. If addressed by older persons, he must respond with a bow. He was to bow as he entered and left the school, and bow to every man or woman, old or young, rich or poor, black or white, whom he met on the road. Special punishment was visited on him if he failed to show respect to the aged, the poor, the colored, or to any persons whatever whom God had visited with infirmities. He was thus taught to stand in awe of the rights of humanity.

"Honesty was urged as a religious duty, and unpaid debts were represented as infamy. He was allowed to be sharp at a bargain, to shudder at dependence, but still to prefer poverty, to deception or fraud. His industry was not urged by poverty but by duty. Those who imposed upon him early responsibility and restraint led the way by their example, and commended this example by the prosperity of their fortunes and the respectability of their position as the result of their virtues. He felt that they governed and restrained him for his good, and not their own.

"He learned to identify himself with the interests he was set to promote. He claimed every acre of his father's ample farm,

and every horse and ox and cow and sheep became constructively his, and he had a name for each. The waving harvests, the garnered sheaves, the gathered fruits, were all his own. And besides these, he had his individual treasures. He knew every trout hole in the streams; he was great in building dams, snaring rabbits, trapping squirrels, and gathering chestnuts and walnuts for winter store. Days of election, training, thanksgiving, and school-intermissions were bright spots in his life. His long winter evenings, made cheerful by sparkling fires within, and cold clear skies, and ice-crusts on plains, and frozen streams for his sled and skates, were full of enjoyment. And then he was loved by those whom he could respect, and cheered by that future for which he was being prepared. Religion he was taught to regard as a necessity and luxury, as well as a duty. He was daily brought into contemplation of the Infinite, and made to regard himself as ever on the brink of an endless being. With a deep sense of obligation, a keen sensitive conscience, and a tender heart, the great truths of religion appeared in his eye as sublime, awful, practical realities, compared with which earth was nothing. Thus he was made brave before men for the right, while he lay in the dust before God.

"Such was Haddam training one hundred years ago. Some may lift their hands in horror at this picture, but it was a process which made moral heroes. It exhibited a society in which wealth existed without idleness or profligacy; social elevation without arrogance; labor without degradation; and a piety which by its energy and martyr endurance, could shake the world.

"We are not to suppose that boyhood passed under these influences was gloomy or joyless: far from it. Its activity was bliss; its growth was a spring of life; its achievements were victories. Each day garnered some benefit; and rising life, marked by successive accumulations, left a smile on the conscience and bright and reasonable hopes for the future.

"We might have desired that this Puritan training had left childhood a little larger indulgence—had looked with interest

at present enjoyment as well as at future good,—had smiled a little more lovingly on the innocent gambols, the ringing laughter, the irrepressible mirth of boyhood ; and had frowned less severely on imperfections clinging to human nature itself. We might think that, by insisting too much on obligation and too little on privilege,—too much on the law and too little on the gospel,—too much on the severity and too little on the goodness of the Deity,—the conscience may have been stimulated at the expense of the affections, and men fitted for another world at an unnecessary sacrifice of their amiability and happiness in the present life.

“ But in leaving this Puritan training, the world had ‘ gone farther and fared worse.’ To repress the iniquity of the age and land, to save the young men for themselves, their country and their God, I believe we shall gain most, not by humoring childhood’s caprices and sneering at strict households, strict governments, and strict Sabbaths, but by going back to many of the modes which gave to the world such men as John Hampden, William Bradford, Jonathan Edwards, Timothy Dwight, and David and John Brainerd.”*

In seeking for those elements which entered into the character of Dr. Brainerd, and those influences which made him what he was, it is important to bear this method of early training in the family in remembrance. At the same time, I could say nothing more appropriate on this occasion, and nothing that would be more useful, than to let Dr. Brainerd himself thus speak on a subject so important as the proper training of the young.

The leading events of his life are soon told. What prompted him to leave his early home, and to enter on the study of the law, I know not. He did, however, what was very common in the part of the country where he was raised. At the age of seventeen, in the year 1821, he left his home to teach school, for the purpose of obtaining the means of a professional education. After teaching about three years, he commenced the

*Life of John Brainerd, pp. 45—49.

study of law, in the village of Rome, in the county of Oneida, first with Alanson Bennett, Esq., and then with the Hon. Henry A. Foster, and the Hon. Chester Hayden.

In the meantime, however, and near the close of those preparatory studies, an important event had occurred, which led to an entire change of his purpose of life. It was in that vicinity that the Rev. Charles G. Finney, who had himself been a lawyer, began his labors in the ministry, and his most marked early success as a preacher occurred in that place in a revival of religion of great power. In that revival, nearly every merchant, almost every lawyer, and almost every man of influence, was converted, and among the converts was young Brainerd. His course of life, up to that time, had been moral and correct. He had been preserved from vices to which all are exposed in early life; and in his case there had been one instance, at least, in which he had been preserved from danger of ruin, by an event which bears a strong resemblance to the manner in which Dr. Paley was saved from a similar danger, and with a like perception of his early promise. "You are a great fool," said a friend to young Paley, when he saw him yielding to temptations and becoming the companion of young men of dissipation. "You," said he, "have talents, which may raise you to eminence, if you will cultivate them. These young men, your companions, have not, and it is of little consequence what becomes of them." Paley took the hint so roughly given, forsook his companions, and placed his name among those which are most eminent in English literature. In the public house where young Brainerd boarded, there was a number of young men who spent their nights in drinking and carousing. On one of those evenings, young Brainerd happened to be among them. The keeper of the house went into the room and said, "Brainerd, you had better go to bed. Those young men are going to ruin. But you were born for better purposes." He, too, took the hint, and was ever afterward saved from the temptation. No man through life was a more thorough temperance man than he was.

I am ignorant of the mental exercises through which he passed at that time. I know only that he became a member of the church in Rome, in 1825; that he at once abandoned his profession; that he chose the profession of the ministry without hesitation; and that his conversion changed the entire current of his life. With a view to secure the means of prosecuting his theological studies, he spent a year in teaching in Philadelphia. During that time he was connected with the church of the Rev. James Patterson, and entered heartily with him into every measure for promoting the interests of religion in the northern part of the city.

In October, 1828, he entered the Theological Seminary in Andover, and graduated there in the class of 1831. He was ordained as an evangelist in New York, October 7th, 1831, and went immediately to the West, as a home missionary. In December of that year he was settled as pastor of the Fourth Church in Cincinnati, where he labored two years. In March, 1833, he became editor of the *Cincinnati Journal*, which he conducted, together with the *Youth's Magazine*, until the autumn of 1836, nearly four years. During that period he assisted the Rev. Dr. Beecher as a preacher in the Second Presbyterian Church of that city, an event which laid the foundation of mutual confidence and affection for life. In October, 1836, he was called to the pastoral charge of the Third Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, where he commenced his labors February 1st, 1837. His pastoral life here embraced a period of just about thirty years—as eventful years in the history of the Church and of our own country as any that have occurred since we became a nation. The history of those years is familiar to you all.

I have referred, with a special design, to the fact that Dr. Brainerd was converted under the preaching of the Rev. Charles G. Finney; that he was early associated in labor with the Rev. James Patterson; and that he was more intimately, and for a longer time, associated with Dr. Lyman Beecher; for it was by the influence of these men and their preaching, more than by any other cause, perhaps unconsciously to him-

self, that his character as a preacher was formed. Perhaps no three men could be named whose character and mode of preaching would be more likely to influence a mind like his. He himself was indeed original. He copied no one. He probably never set any man before him as a model; he transferred to himself in no perceptible manner, the language, the modes of thought, or the theological opinions of another man; but there was, if I mistake not, a silent influence of great power which went forth from his early connection with those men, which greatly affected his subsequent character as a preacher and pastor. Two of these men have passed away; hundreds, perhaps thousands, will bless the name of each one of them forever, as the instrument, under God, of their conversion.

Charles G. Finney.—Dr. Brainerd's earliest religious impressions were probably received from him. Mr. Finney had himself been a lawyer, and would have been distinguished as a lawyer if he had continued to pursue that profession. Not always safe in his theological opinions, and not having been trained to great thoroughness in theological learning, he was, nevertheless, a man of great power in showing to men the danger of false hopes; in setting forth the real nature of religion; in driving men from their subterfuges and refuges of lies; in proclaiming the terrors of the law and the fearfulness of the world to come; in laying open to men the delusions of their own hearts; and above all, in proclaiming the majesty of God and the greatness of eternal things, and in making all things else dwindle to nothingness before the Eternal One, and the eternal world. Few men in our country have been as well fitted to act on the higher order of minds, or to bring men, proud in their philosophy or their own righteousness, to the foot of the cross.

James Patterson.—Not graceful in manner; not polished in sentences and periods; not aiming at beauty of style; and not courting the praises of men—with a keen eye that penetrated the soul; with a tall and impressive form; with unpolished but most forcible gestures; with an earnestness of manner that showed that his whole soul was on fire; never awed by the

fear of any man; ready to do good in any way, whether in approved or unapproved modes, if the hearts of men could be reached; at home, alike in the fields, in the highways, and in the sanctuary; preaching everywhere; talking everywhere; praying everywhere; most fearful in his warnings of sinners, most terrible in portraying the wrath to come, and yet most affable, genial, pleasant in his intercourse with men—he lived and labored for the sole purpose of converting men. He had an unwavering faith in revivals of religion, and his ministry was made up of successive revivals rapidly following each other, bringing great multitudes into the kingdom of God.

Dr. Lyman Beecher.—Than he there has been, in our country, no man more eloquent in the pulpit; no man that could make a more effective use of the Anglo-Saxon language. Clear, rapid, discriminating; placing truth in a few words in the light of a sunbeam; rising often to the highest flights of oratory; often exhibiting the most beautiful poetic conceptions in language most expressive of those conceptions; and then, as with a sledge-hammer, driving great thoughts through the soul until you were penetrated through and through with them; piling on arguments until you were crushed and weary; not always equal, and sometimes falling so low that you wondered where was the great power of the man—but even then in what seemed to be tame, and dull, and sombre, like a dull day, by some new and startling thought suddenly illuminating all as by a flash from the heavens—he labored, too, for revivals of religion. I have sat while he was urging great thoughts through my soul till I was weary and could bear no more. His eye was then eloquent. The adjusting of his spectacles was eloquent; his whole manner was eloquent. He sought revivals as the glorious triumph of the Gospel; and his great thoughts and his keen words were designed to secure this result. There has been but one man in this country that understood the Saxon part of our language as well as Dr. Beecher.—Daniel Webster.

Dr. Brainerd, whether he was conscious of any influence from.

these sources or not, carried much of all this into his subsequent life ; and his style of public speaking was formed much on these models. He would have risen high in the profession which he had first chosen. He had been endowed with those talents which we naturally associate with the best efforts at the bar—a deep knowledge of human nature ; a quick perception of the point at issue ; power of disentangling that from all other points ; skill in debate ; abundance of illustration and of anecdote ; the power of perceiving the weak points of an adversary and the strong points of his own cause ; keenness of sarcasm and invective, if necessary ; the power of anticipating the point of defence of an adversary ; readiness in summoning to his memory all that he knew ; and a power seldom equalled of showing the heinousness of guilt, and the evils of a violation of law.

Dr. Brainerd's power eminently was that of a public speaker—a public speaker in regular and set discourses, but perhaps more strikingly in debate. His early opportunities of scholarship had not been great, and the state of his health and his abundant public duties and his active life had prevented his greatly enlarging his scholarship. He had, indeed, by reading, by observation, by conversation, stored his mind with a great amount of information on the subjects most important for him to know ; but it did not pertain, in any remarkable degree, to either scientific or literary subjects. Of information to be derived from the daily press, perhaps no man surpassed him ; of information derived from observation and a keen sagacity, there were none of his brethren who were his equals. His literary labors were mostly confined, with one exception, which I shall have occasion to notice, to a few sermons, to a few articles in our *Quarterly Review*, and to the newspaper press. To the latter, alike by his taste and by his conviction that in this way truth could be best promulgated, regulating the public mind and correcting public errors, he contributed much ; and there are few men, even of those devoted to the newspaper press, that could reach the public in this way in a more timely, sagacious, and effective manner.

As a public speaker, alike in the pulpit and in deliberative bodies, with no particular advantage of manner, but with much, arising from his nervous temperament, that would seem to promise little, he yet had a power which few men possess. In preaching, he often plunged at once into the middle of his subject, and made most direct and earnest appeals to the reason and conscience; in debate, he seized at once upon the real point in question, and pressed that with a power of argument, with a fervor of language, with an amplitude of illustration, and with a severity of invective and sarcasm, if necessary, which few men have ever exhibited in debate. His language in his public discourses, whether extemporary or written, was as nearly perfect as possible; and often his happiest efforts—efforts seldom surpassed—were in extemporary address. No man could use the English language better; from the lips of no one could fall more pertinent and fit words; more complete sentences; more beautiful figures; more striking illustrations. In description, in statement, in argument, in warning, in appeal, in invective, his language presented the best forms of our Anglo-Saxon tongue. Often in a public assembly—in such a vast concourse as was assembled in the great hall in 1857—when the interest of the meeting languished, a few words from him roused the vast assembly; when the course of things was taking an unprofitable direction, a few remarks from him, with no reflection cast on others, changed the current of remark and feeling, and gave in a moment, a new aspect to the course of things.

When he fell so suddenly by death, there occurred that of which the prophet Isaiah speaks as a great public calamity, when God takes away "the eloquent orator;" or, as it is expressed more appropriately in the margin, and with an eminent adaptedness to his case, "*the skillful of speech.*" Isa. iii, 3. No words could better describe Dr. Brainerd's eloquence than to say that he was "skillful of speech;" none could better represent the impression which his eloquence made on his hearers. No man could hear him, in his happiest moods, without being impressed with the force and beauty of our own

English tongue, and the greatness of the endowment of being able to speak in such words for truth and for God.

For the endowment of being "skillful of speech" is one of God's great gifts to man; one of the noblest and the most marvelous of our talents; one which, as much as any other, alike in the original power and in the highest forms of that power, shows the Creator's greatness and wisdom. No philosopher has been able to explain how man at first learned to speak; none could teach man to speak if God had not taught Adam; none who deny the miraculous agency of the Creator can explain how it is.

And it is worthy of such an origin as it had. Alike in the daily intercourse of life, in our business, in our enjoyments, and in all the great purposes of Divine Providence in the advancement of the interests of the world, it shows itself worthy of such an origin. For speech has been connected with all the purposes of justice. It has been a prime agent in the defence of liberty. It has been identified with the triumphs of religion and the salvation of souls. Speech in the Senate house; speech in the hall of justice; speech before a battle; speech in a pulpit has been identified with all the triumphs of justice, liberty and religion in the world. There is no power like the power of Demosthenes, Cicero, Burke, Chatham, Webster. It sways the passions, and the will, and the intellect, and the imaginations of men, as the trees of the forest are moved by the mighty winds, and, more than to the power of arms in battle, is the progress of the world to be traced to the power of language.

It is most noble, and reaches its highest and most distinct results, when employed in proclaiming the Gospel to men. The pulpit is its loftiest place, and there the purposes of God in speech are most signally accomplished. In defending the truth of God, in proclaiming his will, in publishing the great facts of redemption, in persuading men to turn from sin, in making known the realities of eternity, in inviting a lost race to the cross—that is its highest office and its sublimest employment. Paul on Mars' Hill, in proclaiming the Gospel, was

greater than Demosthenes thundering against Phillip; Whitefield at the collieries, was greater in the results of his speaking, than Burke in the splendors of Westminster Hall on the trial of Warren Hastings, or than Patrick Henry when he summoned the American colonies to freedom.

The success of Dr. Brainerd as a pastor depended not only on the character of his preaching, but, in a large degree, on his character as a man. His frank, open, genial manners; the fact that he was accessible at all times; his affability; the interest which he took in the wants of others; his sympathy with the poor, the sick, and the bereaved; his happy addresses on funeral occasions; and especially his appreciation of the feelings, the aspirations, and the strugglings of young men, contributed in an eminent degree to this, and, to an unusual extent, he retained these characteristics in advancing years, when he had reached a period of three-score. From any thing that appears, his preaching, and his mode of intercourse with the young, was as attractive in his last years, as it had been at any former period of his life. Probably at no period of his life were there more young men, in proportion to the whole number in attendance on his ministry, than in his last years, and it was one of the things that eminently gladdened his heart, in all the discouragements from the position of his church—which he felt indeed keenly—that while numbers of his best families were removing in the general tide that was, and is, setting to other parts of the city, he was still drawing around him the young, the enterprising, and the prosperous, just as they were forming their character, to sustain this ancient and venerable church.

Dr. Brainerd, as a pastor, had one peculiarity in his labors and plans, which it is not improper to advert to, as it, in his case, was attended with marked success. It was, that while he labored earnestly for revivals of religion, and relied on such works of grace in promoting the progress of religion, he looked for the most marked success at a certain season of the year. The ordinary labors of the autumn and winter were almost uniformly followed by special efforts,

mostly in the form of protracted meetings, in the close of the winter, and the beginning of the spring ; and then he hoped to gather, as in a harvest, the result of the labors of the year. These efforts were almost uniformly successful, and a large portion of those received into the church, during his ministry here, were admitted at that season of the year. At such times his own labors and anxieties were so exhausting as to make, in his case, the ordinary rest to which pastors, with other men, look forward in the Summer months, absolutely indispensable.

Dr. Brainerd was a man whose labors and influence could not be confined to his own particular church, or to his own denomination, or to religion alone. He was not made to be a mere "parish minister," and the churches of our own denomination here and elsewhere, and the cause of religion in general, and the interests of patriotism and the country, owe much to his zeal, his talents, his large catholic spirit, and his patriotism.

Philadelphia, and especially our own denomination, owes much to his counsels, and to his persevering efforts, in the establishment of the churches which have been organized here since he became pastor of this church.*

*In his "Quarter Century" Sermon, delivered nearly five years ago, he makes the following reference among other things, to what he had done in this respect:

"During my ministry here, I have been called to deliver an address at the laying of the corner stone of Calvary Church, Olivet Church, Walnut Street Church, W. P., German Street Church, Rising Sun Church, Norriton Church, Reeseville Church, Camden Church, O. S. Church at Bridesburgh, Third Church, Elizabethtown, N. J., Central Church, Wilmington, Del., Rev. Mr. Dunning's Church, Baltimore and others.

"By order of Presbytery, I organized Calvary Church, Green Hill Church, Rising Sun Church, Camden Church, Beverly Church, and some others. I was also present in the little circle which planned the establishment of the Presbyterian House ; now a treasure to our denomination. The *Presbyterian Quarterly Review* originated in a council of the late Dr. Gilbert, Dr. Parker, Rev. Mr. Barnes, and myself.

"I have preached at the installation of the Rev. Dr. Jenkins, Calvary Church ; Rev. Dr. Darling, Clinton street ; Rev. Dr. Patton, Western Church, Rev. Mr. Gould, Norristown ; Rev. Mr. Mears, Camden ; Rev. Mr. Bliss, Beverly ; Rev. Mr. Eva, Kensington ; and of some others which I do not now recall, as I keep no journal. I have never coveted these services, but have always shrunk from them when duty would permit."

The renovation of this church was owing very much to his conviction of the necessity of such renovation, that it might maintain the position which it had long held, and to his personal efforts.*

The Green Hill church had its origin entirely in his convictions of the necessity of such a church in that part of the city. His own residence, for seven years, owing to feeble health, was in that part of what is now the city, but what was then a suburb, lying quite beyond the city, but which he saw would soon demand a church of our denomination. The lot on which the church stands was secured by him, and a considerable part of the funds for building the church, was raised by his own personal efforts.†

To him almost entirely it is owing that the Clinton street church is now connected with our denomination. It was about to pass from the congregational denomination to other hands, and that it did *not* pass to a denomination in no way connected with us, is to be ascribed to his determination of purpose. He formed the plan of securing it to our denomination, and he and the Rev. Anson Rood, by personal solicitations and efforts, secured the amount necessary to carry out the purpose.

The Calvary church owes its establishment much to his efforts, and to his counsels, and it may be safely said, that if it had not been for his efforts, and for his remarkable influence over men of wealth, this enterprise would never have been carried through. Forty meetings were held, sometimes protracted to a late hour in the night, in consultation on the plan, and in efforts to secure its success. From those meetings he was almost

* Of this he says in his "Quarter Century" Sermon.

"When I came to this church edifice it was barn like in its aspects. We had no Vestibule; no Lecture, Sunday School, nor Business rooms. Our weekly lectures were held in the great dimly-lighted church; our Sunday School in the high galleries and high-backed pews. We have not dwelt 'in ceiled houses,' and allowed the house of our God 'to lie desolate.' By the appropriation of thirty thousand dollars, all paid, you have made this edifice worthy of the age and the cause to which it is devoted."

† He says in his "Quarter century" Sermon, that he 'gave two months of successful labor towards erecting the Gothic edifice on Girard avenue.'

never absent ; and in all that was doubtful about it, he never lost his confidence in it, or faltered in his own purpose that it should be accomplished. Often did his voice rouse and animate those assembled, when desponding or doubtful; and often did his appeals, and his ready wit—even when there was some hazard of giving offence in such appeals—create new zeal in the cause. He could say things which others could not have said without giving offence. On one occasion, when the whole enterprise seemed to hang in doubt, he rose and said with deep gravity and solemnity : “ Gentlemen, there are certain christian graces which those in your condition have never had the privilege of exercising. The grace of submission in times of poverty the grace of a deep sense of dependence on God for your daily bread ; the grace which they exercise who, at the head of a family, see their children crying for bread; and the grace needed to sustain the heart in the night-watches, when a man does not know where provision is to come from to supply the morning meal—these and similar graces of the Christian, you have never had the opportunity of exercising ; and probably never will. The grace which you are called upon to exercise is that which arises from the right use of property—from devoting it to God in promoting his cause ; from doing what is necessary to be done to secure the spread of religion around you—and if you do not do this, *the Lord have mercy on your souls*”. Any man might well have hesitated as to what would be the effect of such an appeal. From some men it would have been received with cold silence, or would have stirred up wrath. There was, indeed, at the close of this singular speech, a momentary silence, and then all present burst out into a loud laugh—and his object was accomplished.

To his efforts, also, associated with the members of this church and congregation, it is owing that the German Street church has been completed, and has been retained to our denomination, and at the time of his death he had projected a new enterprise in the extreme South-eastern part of the city, with an ultimate reference to the establishment of a church.

Dr. Brainred, though he was a decided Calvinist in his doc-

trinal views, and a thorough Presbyterian in his convictions on the proper mode of the organization and government of the church ; and though in all that long conflict which has been waged with the other ' Branch' of our denomination—alike in the trial of Dr. Beecher, for heresy, when he was associated with him as a preacher; in the debates of the General Assembly previous to the division, of which he was a member;* in the division of the church in 1838 ; and in all the long period since, now nearly thirty years, he has been thoroughly identified, on the firmest conviction of truth and justice, with our branch of the church, true to its rights, to its principles, and to its interests, yet he was not a bigoted man, or a man who regarded all the interests of truth, of religion, and of humanity, as confined to his own denomination. In the Temperance cause ; in Union Prayer meetings; in promoting the interests of religion in general ; in public matters, he did not make it a subject of enquiry whether they were controlled by Presbyterians, or whether his own denomination was to acquire strength or credit as being prominent in such public movements. As long as the great prayer meetings in Jayne's Hall shall be remembered, Dr. Brainerd will be remembered as having, with that holy man of the Baptist denomination, Dr. Kennard, and Dudley Tyng, of the Episcopal, both now with him before the throne of the same Saviour, contributed as much as any other man to the interest and the success of the meeting.

It occurred before his death that there was an opportunity of evincing, in a manner such as there has never before been an opportunity of evincing, the love of country; and in that fearful struggle of four years, all that was the proper fruit of his early training, and of the Puritan doctrine which he had been taught to believe, and all that was generous, large-hearted

* He was a member of the General Assembly in May, 1866, the year before the " Excluding Acts," leading to the division of the church were passed. His being a member of the Assembly that year was the immediate occasion of his being employed during the Summer as a stated supply in the Pine Street church, which resulted in his being called to the church as its Pastor.

and patriotic in his nature, was fully developed. He felt, as few even then felt, that all that was dear to liberty was at stake. He felt more keenly than most men feel the evil of treason and rebellion. He appreciated in the highest degree the blessings of liberty for which our fathers fought in the war of Independance, and anticipated with more apprehension than most men did the evils which would result if the rebellion should be successful. He was not formed to be a military man, and he was too old, and his health too much impaired, even if his position had not prevented it, to join in the active defence of his country. But he could defend by his eloquent appeals the righteous cause; he could denounce in such burning words as few men could use the evils of treason and rebellion; he could stimulate and animate his own people in sustaining the government; he could encourage his own young men to give themselves to the service of their country; he could counsel and animate them as they left their homes for the field of strife, perhaps not to return again; he could meet the soldier on his way to the battle-field at the "Refreshment Room," and encourage him in his purpose, and could greet him again on his return, weary, or sick, or wounded, and minister to his wants; and he could visit the great hospitals of our city, as a minister of consolation to impart comfort to the wounded, the sick, and the dying. And it was done; done as this work was done by no other pastor in this city. For four years he was under as intense excitement as his physical frame could bear:—an excitement unintermitted by day and by night, wearing on his exhausted nervous system, perhaps hastening the event which we mourn to-day. From this intense excitement he found no rest, no intermission—until that eventful night when the news ran through the city that "General Lee and his army had surrendered." Then thousands crowded the streets. Then the sound of joy and rejoicing was heard every where. Then tears of joy flowed freely. Then men met men as they had not done for four years before. Then, in as sublime a scene as our country has witnessed, thousands of voices spontaneously joined in front of the building where the Decla-

ration of Independence was made, in singing to Old Hundred,

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow,"

and then—who could have done it more appropriately than he—
Dr. Brainerd led the vast multitude in expressing thanks to
God.

Beyond his newspaper labors, a few sermons, a few tracts
and a few articles in our Presbyterian Quarterly—of which he
was one of the founders, and of which he continued to be one
of the editors to the time of his death, Dr. Brainerd's published
productions are not numerous. It is remarkable, and it was
singularly appropriate, that the only literary work of consider-
able magnitude in which he engaged, was the *Life* of a mem-
ber of the Brainerd family, who was comparatively unknown,
and who died seventy years since: a modest, earnest, humble,
patient, and laborious missionary. The name of *David* Brainerd
was known as far as that of any man in modern times who
has engaged in the work of missions. That name has been
most influential in promoting the present movement in the
work of converting the world. More than perhaps by any
other man, the character of Henry Martyn had been formed,
and his zeal awakened, by the character and life of David
Brainerd. But the name of *John*, his brother and his succes-
sor, not less pious and devoted to his Master's cause, was little
known. He had labored in obscurity; he had not been remark-
ably successful in his work among the Indians; he had become
an humble pastor in an obscure church; and he had died with
no one as yet to record his worth, and to perpetuate the record
of his labors.

It occurred to Dr. Brainerd to endeavor to rescue from for-
getfulness what could be recovered respecting his life and la-
bors, and to hold him up, also, as an example to the church
and the world. To this work he gave the leisure of the last years
of his life. On that work he bestowed a great amount of la-
bor, in correspondence and in traveling, and gathered all that
there was to be gathered, alike in this country and in Europe,
in memory of a man little known, and over whose remains for

nearly seventy years there was not even a stone to mark the place of his rest; for whom, as Dr. Brainard remarked, "no Gazette heralded his departure, no orator gave him an eulogy, and no generous appreciation raised him a monument."*

This work, most happily executed, and which furnishes a ground for regret that its author gave no more to the world through the press, might be appropriately considered as the biography of three men of rare piety and usefulness. *David* Brainerd, a sketch of whose life is necessarily given to prepare the way for the notice of his brother and successor, *John*, the obscure and unknown, but faithful missionary; and the *author himself*. Some of Dr. Brainerd's best thoughts, and some of the happiest specimens of his writing, and specimens that will compare favorably with any others found in our best writers, occur in that volume. As a specimen of his style and manner, and as an illustration of the remark which I have just made, I will copy a single paragraph, alike for its own beauty, and for the justness of its reflections.

"In moving into the future, it is the destiny of man to move into relative darkness. Every individual human advance is an adventure in paths dim, difficult, and perilous, never yet trodden; an experiment of labors and perils not yet endured, of responsibilities yet to be discharged, and of aims and elevations yet to be surmounted. No wonder that in these circumstances man looks around him to inquire 'Has any one mapped out the way? Has any one successfully threaded the difficult and dreary paths? Has any one borne the labors and overcome the dangers? Has any one scaled the heights, and laid his hand on the proffered prize?'

"The martial spirit is kept alive by the great names and achievements of its heroes: its Cæsars, Wellingtons, and Napoleons. Science renews its energy in communion with the names of its Galileos, Lockes, and Newtons. Men are brave to strike for human freedom under the shelter of the great examples of Hampden, Cromwell, and Washington. The bio-

*Life of John Brainerd, pp. 434, 435.

graphies of the eminent dead not only furnish illustrations of what the living may be, and do, and dare ; they not only lift men above the crowd to a higher estimate of human capacity and power ; they do more through the social principles by which one is set to imitate the good works which he contemplates in others. The church of God has always availed itself of these principles of our nature ; and while war has cherished its heroes, and science its devotees, christianity has wisely embalmed the memory of her great teachers, her saints, and her martyrs. It is well it is so ; for, however dwarfed may be the present age in any grace or attainment, the true and growing christian can find solace, sympathy, and companionship with the more excellent men and things of the past," pp. 10, 11.*

It was also a remarkable—can we suppose it to have been otherwise than a Providential arrangement—that the last public service of Dr. Brainerd should have had reference to the name which he himself bore, and that it should have occurred in the very place, "The Forks of the Delaware," where these brothers—David and John whose memory he had thus contributed to perpetuate and embalm, had successively labored. A church had been founded at Easton,† called the "Brainerd church," in honor of the labors of David Brainerd, and he was invited to address the "Brainerd Missionary Society" in that church. It was his closing work on earth. Feeble, then; with a trembling frame; with a voice so weak as scarcely to be audible ; under the influence of a state of body which was in a few weeks to remove him from earth, he performed his last public services there on earth, and finished the labors of a life spent in eminent usefulness in the church of God.‡

* For similar specimens of beautiful writing, and of valuable sentiments, I may refer to pp. 88-91 ; 93-95 ; 102, 103 ; 122.

† On the Missionary Field of David Brainerd.

‡ That sermon has been published under the title, "The last sermon of the Rev. Thomas Brainerd, D. D." It is on the text, "Let no man despise thy youth."

Like David Brainerd, and like most of his family, he was a man subject to depression of spirits ; and he apprehended much, as his own father had suffered much, in the closing scene of life. He apprehended paralysis, perhaps months or years of helplessness, and at the same time months or years of mental darkness and depression. From both these he was mercifully preserved. In a moment, almost in the twinkling of an eye, without any thing unusual to excite apprehension or alarm, without pain, without consciousness, he was taken from earth to heaven. Could the warmest affection for him have ordered the circumstances of his death more mercifully or kindly ?*

I trust that it will not be regarded as inappropriate, in conclusion, to refer, in a word, to my own personal feelings, and my own sense of loss, when he was so suddenly taken away. Never before have I so felt that I stood alone on the shores of the great ocean of eternity, as I felt then, and why should not the personal friendship of so many years be allowed to utter its feelings, in sympathy with a mourning congregation, on an occasion like this ?

Why should not the memory of other days come over my soul here ? Why should I not speak of the loss which I have sustained as well as you ? Why should I not be permitted, while I speak of his public life, also to bear my testimony to him as a warm hearted, true, generous, sincere, and affectionate friend ? For, for an unusual period in human life—for thirty years—we were united in such intimacy and friendship as rarely exists on earth, and is still more rarely prolonged for such a period :—for we lived and labored side by side ; we took sweet counsel together ; we traveled together ; we prayed together ; we rejoiced together ; we mourned together. We had no envies, jealousies, or heart-burnings, and there was nothing to be forgiven on either side when he died. We rejoiced each in the success of the other as if it were his own success—for it was success in the cause which we both loved, and in the advancement of that Master's

* He died at Scranton, Pennsylvania, August 21, 1866.

kingdom which we were both endeavoring to promote. When he was buried, I felt as if half of myself was in that coffin, and was committed to that grave—how could I help it? I have younger friends among my brethren, dear to my heart, and securing daily more and more my affections, but you must approach the period where the ominous number “threescore and ten” is not remote, to understand how a man feels when the friend of thirty years—and such a friend—is committed to the tomb.

ART. V.—NOTES ON DIFFICULT PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. FREDERIC A. ADAMS, Orange N. J.

MARK xvi, 3, 4; “Who shall roll us away the stone from the door? and when they looked they saw that the stone was rolled away, for (*ἔαπε*) it was very great.”

The question is: what does the “for” here connect? Following our translation, it cannot connect the statement that it was rolled away with the assertion that it was very great: its greatness not being a natural cause, or condition of its being rolled away, but rather the contrary. And so for want of a better resource, it has been interpreted as connecting back to “who shall roll,”—and in conformity with this many of our Bibles have the intervening words: “and when they looked,”—etc. inclosed in parenthesis. This is harsh and satisfies no careful reader. Bloomfield, who is good at recognizing difficulties, has stated the case so briefly, that it is well perhaps to bring the question forward in his words.

“The commentators have been not a little perplexed with this clause, because it cannot be referred to what immediately precedes. To remove this difficulty, some would take the *ἔαπε* in the sense of *δὲ*. That however is too much a “device for

the nonce." It is better with some commentators to suppose that the word refers, not to the clause which immediately preceded, but to the one before that, "*Who shall roll,*" &c.; the intermediate words being regarded as parenthetical. Yet the construction will not admit of the parenthesis, and thus the difficulty remains in its full force, and nothing would seem to remove it but to transpose the words, as is done by Newcome and Wakefield. But for that there is little* authority; and what may be allowable in forming translations, is not so in editing the words of an original. I cannot but think that the "for" has reference to some clause omitted: not indeed that which Whitty, Grotius and Rosenmüller too arbitrarily suppose, 'and this happened luckily for them;' but to something that may be supplied from both the preceding sentences," &c. The commentator has here been brought, by stress of common sense, in sight of the true solution; but he need not supply any thing from the preceding sentences, but only translate the Greek that is before him. If the reader will accept without offence the Greek inversion, he may read the translation thus: "And looking up they see with surprise that rolled away is the stone, for it was very great." Note the present tense for the past to give life to the picture; note also the inversion, as emphasizing the fact; and then pass on to the words "they see with surprise," offered as the translation of *σεωροῦσι*. This word is the key of the passage, and the proposed translation must be justified. The verb *σεωρέω* is derived from *σεωρός*, a religious commissioner or ambassador, sent by a particular state to represent that state in the common religious rites at the great games, or other general assemblies of the Greeks;—and his performance of that duty was expressed by this word. Now such a commissioner in his ambassage saw wonderful things; he saw the most famous men, the noblest pageants, and the highest performances that were seen in all Greece,—that is, in the whole world. And when he came home he would have much to tell of the wonderful things he had seen; and his citizens, doubtless,

* Query; Is there any authority at all?

who had not the daily papers, and spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing, would regard him chiefly in the light of a sight-seer. The verb, then which expressed his particular duty, must of necessity pass over into the meaning, to see as something great and noble, to see with wonder, or surprise.

But did not others also see these great sights? Yes; but the Θεωρός much more. He was the most honored guest, clothed in splendor, observed of all observers; he had the best seat at every assemblage, and the best sight of every thing that passed; hence it is *his* sight-seeing in distinction from all others that gives the hint for the formation of the verb.

Now Mark, in writing his narrative, has something in his mind that calls for that word, when he says "they saw" etc: what was that thing? We reply, *wonder*, or *surprise*; and "for" connects this word with the clause that follows,—the cause of the surprise.

Mark xi: 13—15: And seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it he found nothing but leaves; for (γὰρ) the time of figs (καιρός σύκων) was not yet. And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter forever!

On this passage three questions arise. The first is; what was the design or meaning of the whole transaction. On this we shall not dwell, longer than to indicate in the fewest words, the view of Olshausen, which seems quite satisfactory; namely, that our Saviour with his mind burdened in these last days with the thoughts of the people's wickedness and coming doom saw in this fig tree, as he came to it and found nothing but leaves when he had looked for figs, a striking instance of unfruitfulness, and relieved his burdened mind by pronouncing an instant doom upon it.

We pass to the two questions that remain; both of verbal interpretation; first the meaning of "the time of figs," second the connexion of "for." Does the "time of figs," then, mean the time when the figs are seen growing on the tree, or the time when they are taken from the tree, i. e. harvest time. Here the commentations divide. Without discussion, we say (a) it

may mean harvest time ; for the words are so used elsewhere as quoted by Bloomfield ; and (b) it must mean harvest time, because it cannot mean the other. The proof of this is that our Saviour went to the tree for figs, which he would not have done if it had *not* been a time for figs to be on the tree. An other proof is, that so understood, the narration conforms to the facts. The time of the transaction was early spring ; the first harvest of figs was in early summer ; therefore the time of figs had not come, and if we understand the Bible to say so, we shall understand the thing as it was. Further, there were leaves on the tree, for the narrative says so ; but the fruit of the fig tree starts as soon as the leaves, as all authorities assure us. Now if the leaves had started, it was time for the fruit on that tree to have started, if there was to be any fruit on it at all. To understand the passage as saying that it was not time for the fruit to be seen on the tree would be to make it say what was not conformed to fact. We translate the passage, therefore, "for the harvest time of figs had not come."

Next, what does *γὰρ* connect. Jesus found nothing but leaves, for the time of harvest had not come. From the fact that Jesus came for food and found none, and from the uttered and executed curse, we are led to see his disappointment and displeasure at the moment when he "found nothing."

Does not connect its clause with this implication of displeasure ? If the harvest time had passed there would have been no disappointment, for there would have been no expectation. The fact that the harvest had not passed, justified the disappointment, and is expressed in the text as the cause of it. He found nothing and was displeased, for no fruit had been harvested.

Such an interpretation is not doing violence to Greek usage. See Matt. xxvii., 23, and the same thing in Mark xvi. 13. When the people cried out ; "Crucify him," Pilate said to them, "For (*γὰρ*) what evil hath he done?" Our translators, wisely accommodating their rendering to the English form of thought and speech, say : "Why, what evil had he done?" The *γὰρ*

connects its clause back to an objection to the demand not expressed. See also Acts xiii., 35, 36: "Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David fell in sleep and was laid unto his fathers." Here we must mentally supply before γὰρ "Now this prophecy was not fulfilled to David." For David, &c.

Matt. xxvi., 45, Mark xiv, 41: "Sleep on now (τὸ κοιπὸν) and take your rest." This phrase has fared very hard with commentators. In speaking of it one needs to use special care not to be entangled in the multitude of things that have been said. We will take a single one of the translations that have been offered, and which has been rejected by high authority. Lange, after introducing more than a dozen commentators and quoting their opinions, does not adopt any one of them, nor does he translate or interpret the passage, but leaves it quite afloat. He introduces Grulich, however, who brings forward the following translation, only to reject it: "Sleep and take your rest in future, when ye shall have more security;" "but this," adds Grulich, "would not be τὸ" This is definite and incisive, and though only an empty dictum, it has the merit of bringing us back from fancies to the words of the text. What is the meaning, then, of this phrase? It means *what is left*, relating always to some whole already in the mind, a part of which is in some way already mentally disposed of; this is "the rest," or "what is left." When applied to time, it means the time that "is left," the future reckoned from some moment that divides it from the time that went before. That dividing moment is the present, either actual or historical. It therefore means, when applied to time, *hereafter* in one of its two meanings, *sometime in the future*, or, *all through the future*, equivalent to *henceforth*. So much for the nature of the word, and its root in the human mind. Now for its use. Cyrus, in Xenophon, says to a company of newly conquered subjects: "Thus far (νῦν) you have saved your lives by yielding obedience to me; hereafter (τὸ λοιπόν) it shall be my care, &c. In Herodotus we read that a certain river had the insolence to carry away one of the king's horses who tried to swim

across it, therefore the king was angry and threatened; "hereafter (τοῖ ῥοιποῦ) I will make the river so shallow that wo men can walk across it." So much for the use, now for the grammar of it. In the earlier and best Greek the genitive form (τ. ῥοιποῦ) meant *sometime in the future*; the accusative form meant *all through the future*; but in the later Greek this distinction of form is not kept, the language yields to the general law under which the sharp chiseling of the cases is worn off, and the accusation stands alike for both nations, *all through the future*, or, *sometime in the future*. Examples are not needed here, for this is an accepted and recorded conclusion. We have then all we want; the translation *hereafter* suits the circumstances and the language. "Sleep hereafter and take your rest, but now . . . let us rise and depart."

ART. VI.—A LECTURE ON PARISH PREACHING.

BY THOMAS H. SKINNER, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

1. A Pastor is a minister of Christ, placed by the Holy Spirit at the head of a Parish.* The field of the ministry is the world; in sympathy, and as far as may be, in activity, it is still his field; but a Parish has been sacredly assigned to him, as appropriately and exclusively his own; to labor therein as the official servant of his Divine master.

2. *For dignity and usefulness the Pastoral office is the first in the Church.*† None is above it; every other subserves and culminates in it. It is in the Pastor that we find the minister in the plenitude of his functions. The Pastor is also "a steward of the mysteries of God," "a teacher," "a bishop," "a deacon," "an ambassador for Christ," "a ruler," "an angel," but the converse is not true; some of these names may be taken as

* Acts xx. 28.

† Form of government, chap. iv.

identical in meaning with pastor; otherwise, neither one or the whole of them has as comprehensive an import. Indeed Vinet does not mistake, when he makes the pastor essential to *the typical man*. "It is impossible," he says, "that the pastor should not make a part of the ideal of man—impossible, that He in whom the perfection of human nature was fully represented, should not have been a Pastor." It was necessary, therefore that Christ, the Divine Man, should have borne this office; that this "Pastor of the worlds in the heavens," to use the language of St. Bernard, should also have been the shepherd and bishop of the souls of men.

3. The Pastoral office comprises various functions; conducting worship, celebrating rites, catechising, caring for the poor and the sick, etc; but first and chief among them, is *Parish Preaching; the proper ministry of the word to the Parish*. On this point there is no real difference of opinion. Among pastoral duties, among qualifications for the Pastorate, every one, in truth, gives this the greatest importance. Some would seem to make preaching inferior to reading prayers and ritual celebrations; nay, the very *pis aller*, of the sacred office; but these, as well as all others, do really hold ability in preaching in supreme estimation. Of this, admitted or not, the proof is absolute. Even among the most ritualistic churches, a celebrant, however superior, and however acceptable in domestic and private offices, is of small account, in comparison with a gifted preacher, though less distinguished by aptitudes for the other forms of work. In general opinion, there is no pastoral talent of equal value with ability in the pulpit, and no compensation for the want of it. A minister without this talent, will find himself little desired as a pastor, no church will covet him: no church will, of preference, accept of him.

4. *The paramount importance of Preaching is not a mere theory*: it is grounded in truth, it is historical; invariable experience asserts it. It is a fact without exception, that a pastors' success in his parish, depends on his pulpit work as its condition and chief means. This success is unknown, if it be not impossible, apart from success or faithfulness, in Parish

preaching. It is virtually comprehended in this. This is the prime means of every thing in parish prosperity ; the means of every subordinate means of it ; their origin ; their informing and controlling instrument ; their support ; their perpetuity ; their perennial fountain. After taking away preaching, who would expect the continuance of the proper prosperity of a Parish ? Were not the hope of this, as if one should hope for the continuance of day after sunset ?

5. *Parish preaching, takes its distinctive difference from preaching at large, not only from its being delivered to a parish ; it is already so distinguished when it is delivered* It is already *inherently* parochial, it has copied and wrought into itself the life of the parish. This preaching were otherwise, in no respect different from that of an evangelist, or a minister without charge. Though spoken to a parish the year round, it could in no proper sense be called Parish preaching. "There ought to be, there must be, between a pastor and his flock, a common life, a reciprocal sensation which conforms the auditory to the preacher and the preacher to the auditory. When the preacher has not received from his life as a pastor, the word of command, as to his successive preachings, we may doubt whether his ministry is well discharged, or well understood."*

6. *The fittingness of this preaching, however, to the peculiarity of the Parish, does not either as to matter or manner, substance or form, abridge or provincialize the ministry of the word.* It does not permit or even tolerate such narrowness in the pulpit. In its essence, its tendency, its aim, all true preaching is illimitable, infinite, the same every where, to all mankind: in accommodating itself to diversities of place and people, in city and country, it keeps its own distinctiveness ; it becomes all things to all men, not to promote or perpetuate what it finds, but to produce conformity to itself ; to exalt the thoughts, sentiments, character, aspirations of all to its own sphere of perfection ; it would efface the distinctions

* Vinet.

of rank and education ; it is not sectional, it is not national even : it is local that it may end in the universal ; it is parochial that it may, as far as possible, transform the parish into the paradise of God, what the world will be after its regeneration. Hence its method ; we see it both in its own light and in that of its purpose.

7. *It may be that the Peculiarity of the parish demands special breadth and comprehensiveness, in the preaching most proper to it.* This peculiarity consists, perhaps, in part, of peculiar restrictiveness ; it may have more than a common measure of traditional illiberality, of diversified, old-grown uncharitableness. If the Pastor find that he has to do with a parish of this class, what means shall he use with it ? Shall he direct contention against details of its narrowness, one by one ? Possibly he may be required to do this, but whether he is or not, there is another means to the application of which his call is not questionable. With special diligence he ought to study depth, breadth, altitude, longitude, in his pulpit ministrations to this contracted parish. There is no way so good as this, so potent against the evil to be done away with. Let him bring to bear upon it, the bright and burning light of absolute principle. That light will shine all narrowness away, as the sun when he has risen, shines stars and night-meteors out of the possibility of being seen. As far as possible, all parishes, high and low, rich and poor together, ought to be accustomed to such preaching. Never should parochial interests so affect the eloquence of the pulpit, as in a single instance, to deprive it of this stamp. It is the stamp which the Pastor should seek to reproduce in his parish, in every sermon which he preaches to it.

8. *There is no parish interest, to which the preaching should be indifferent.* Otherwise, it were untrue to the purpose, the nature of Christianity. The tendency of Christianity and as far as it prevails its effect, is, in all respects, the highest advancement of man's well being, in the life which now is, as well as of that which is to come ; in all that concerns him, civil, social, domestic, individual. " Christianity opens a way to itself

even into the details and the extreme parts of life." Its grand means is preaching, the principal work of the Pastor. The minister of a parish, therefore, is unfaithful to his sacred charge, in so far as he does not seek through preaching to bring every parish concern, business, politics, pleasure, art, culture, manners, customs, the whole of parish life, under the domination of Christian principle and Christian law; to make the parish a complete specimen of Christian civilization. But he has his own method of promoting inferior good; the religion he preaches, prescribes it; and if he follow any other, he has need of some one to preach to him; it is no small thing in which he is disobedient. His proper, his only method in treating of all earthly interests is to keep his preaching at its own stand point, looking on these interests from the heights of heaven, still breathing the air of heaven, dealing with the affairs of this life, without entangling itself in them; spiritualizing the material, making the actual eternal; seeking the advancement of society only "through the *individual*—the individuals' christian advancement," in sympathy with the indignant incisiveness of our Lord, when asked to interfere in a quarrel about property;* remembering, that "if on one

"Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" Luke xii., 16.

hand, the human character of christianity, puts it into contract with all the interests of life, gives it a word to speak in all circumstances; on the other hand it never surrenders its liberty to place and time, and with extreme reserve mixes itself with everything that does not bear the stamp of eternity." That such reserve, such elevation above all temporalities while still conversant with them, be retained to christianity, is the condition of its exerting its beneficent influence. Let these eloquent words of Robert Hall, conclude this section of our lecture. "Christianity will civilise, it is true; but it is only when it is allowed to develop the energy by which it sanctifies. Christianity will inconceivably ameliorate the present condition of being—who doubts it? Its universal prevalence, not in the name but reality, will convert this world into a semi-paradisaical

state ; but it is only while it is permitted to prepare its inhabitants for a better. Let her be urged to forget her celestial origin and destiny ; that she came from God and returns to God ; and whether she is employed by the artful and enterprising, as the instrument of establishing a spiritual empire and dominion over mankind, or by the philanthropist as the means of their development and improvement, she resents the foul indignity, claps her wings, and takes her flight, leaving nothing but a base and sanctimonious hypocrisy in her room."

9. *Parish peculiarities do not change or effect the standard of essential merit in preaching.* Truly good preaching is good for all classes. Vary its application as it may it is like christianity, like Christ himself, without respect of persons. Deal with whom it may, its object is to raise them to the summit of the highest good ; it would place the high on a yet higher plane it would give the low an equal elevation. Hence an inviolable law to the Parish pulpit. *It must not deal with the high to the disadvantage of the low ; as far as possible its regards must be common.* The high, on this account, have no right to complain. If they are less profitted, this is but incidental to doing aright such business as public preaching. They should be willing to forego their own advantage ; but contentment is a necessity, imposed by the nature of the work. Preaching is a species of public eloquence "and the true region, the natural medium of eloquence embraces the thoughts of all, and as far as possible the language of all." * "In eloquence" says a great master of the art "the greatest error that can be incurred, is to deviate into abstruse expressions, and out of the beaten track of common sense." † But the high would suffer no loss. In good preaching, breadth and simplicity meet at the same point. Persons of the highest cultivation delight most in simple preaching. They enjoy it the more from their superior culture. "And in this view the preacher's success, thus obtained is of the highest kind ; while that which is done for the purpose of pleasing a certain class is lost on others, without in fact succeeding better with a

*Vinet.

† Cicero.

class whose applause was desired, or whose assent was sought."*

10. *And as the substantive worth of preaching, so likewise its Difficulty, is unmeasured by local and circumstantial diversities.* The latter is at least as great in a rude, as in a highly cultivated parish; in country as in city. In vain does a pastor prefer the former, from the love of ease. Have what field he may, he engages and undertakes to cultivate it, to the full measure of his ability; to make it as far as possible, the garden of the Lord; will he find his task less hard from his having to work in wild land? Do debasement and want of culture in the people facilitate the communication to them of the highest kind of knowledge? If his preaching is suited to the ends of the ministry, to the *wants* of his parish, what city pastor has a deeper or larger acquaintance with hard work? Full proof of his ministry is his goal, irrespective of local peculiarities: he would perhaps strive to reach it, in an aristocratic parish; he ought to reach it if he can, if he is the pastor of the most common country village. He owes it to himself at least to do his best in the ministry of the word, labor in it wherever he may: otherwise he is in peril, be his gift ever so good, of becoming an indifferent preacher; for degeneracy begins in voluntary delinquency; and in principle and generally in fact, it is progressive.—But greater is his debt to his parish; whether refined or barbarian, wise or unwise, it ought to hear from him no other than the best sermons he can make. The obligations of love and covenant engagements, and infinitely more, the love of Christ bind and constrain him to preach well, up to the full measure of his talent.

11. *No pastor should think that good preaching even the best of which he is capable, may be lost upon his parish however humble.*—Discourse constructed and delivered, on principles of highest art, is interesting and useful to all, in proportion not to its plainness and commonness only, but to its excellence in all respects—thought, invention, disposition

*Vinet.

order, vivacity, energy, movement, color, warmth. The better it is in itself, the better an instrument is it, of popular improvement. Hugh Miller speaking of his own pastor, the minister of the church of Cromarty, says: "that some of his clerical cotemporaries used to allege that in exercising his admirable faculties in the theological field, he sometimes forgot to lower himself to his people, and so preached over their heads; and at times when they themselves came to occupy his pulpit, they addressed to the congregation, sermons quite simple enough for even children to comprehend: I taught at the time a class of boys in the Cromarty sabbath school, and universally found, on these occasions, that while the memories of my pupils were charged to the full with the striking thoughts, and very graphic illustrations, of the elaborate discourses deemed too high for them, they remembered of the very simple ones, specially lowered to their narrow capacities, not a single word or note."* He adds a remark involving a principle generally applicable to intellectual work. "All the attempts at originating a cheap literature that have failed, have been attempts pitched too low; the higher efforts have usually succeeded." The remark has its ground in the nature of mind, in all classes, high and low, learned and unlettered. Discourse, indeed every thing, is as nothing to the human mind, which does not excite it, vivify it, move its inherent inquisitiveness, set it to thinking for itself, stimulate while it gratifies its instinctive desire for the knowledge of principles and reasons. The discourse of Him who spake as man spake never, was of all discourse ever heard by man, the most suggestive, and therefore, in part, the most interesting, to the common mind: The common people heard him gladly.

12. *Parish, like other preaching, ought to be clear; as a whole, every sermon should shine, shine brightly with sense; not intelligible only, but to every hearer if possible, interesting, and unmistakable as to meaning. But this great law of oratory does not pre-suppose that oratory, eloquence even—oratory at its height—is in all its utterances, plain, at once. It may with reference to greater ultimate perspicuity,*

to the best understanding of its theme in the sequel, be in parts, designedly mysterious, surprising, above general comprehension. In a preacher especially, it may be an excellent means of giving the hearer a better understanding of truth, first amaze, perplex him a while, as our Lord did Nicodemus, and the people who said: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat;" and his own disciples, after hearing the parables of the sower and the tares. To be most profited by preaching it is needful, that the people perceive their ignorance as compared with their pastor, and be willing to keep in a learning state. For this reason Mr. Baxter, who

—"Preached as though he ne'er should preach again,
And as a dying man to dying men,"

did, usually, as he tells us "put in, something in his sermon which was above the discovery of his hearers, and which they had not known before."^{*}

13. *There is in the best kind of Parish preaching a highly educating virtue*; it gives the best exercise, in kind and measure, to all the faculties of the audience; whence their constant improvement: and, what should be a special motive to the Pastor's progress in sermonizing, a *constant improvement in their faculty of hearing*. They will be made more and more attentive, and more and more competent to understand preaching in its highest spheres. The pastor on his part will "go on into perfection," no faster than they will on theirs. He need have no fear of outgoing them; if he remains with them long enough, they will be among the first in having "an ear to hear," the most excellent kind of sermons, at the end of his course, whatever they may have been in this respect, at the beginning. He cannot over-value this fruit of assiduity in the ministry of word: It is worthy of his utmost aspiration, his most strenuous endeavors as a preacher.

14. *As to actual proficiency in his great work*: This depends in part, on general proficiency in the discharge of his other

^{*}Ormes' Life of Baxter, Vol. I. p. 160.

duites. We have said that Parish preaching, has in itself, subjectively, the image and superscription of Parish individuality. It can have this only through completeness in pastoral activity. To this the preaching inevitably leads; but this, in turn, reacts upon and perfects the preaching. Excellence in the former is the condition of excellence in the latter. United, they both prosper; neither prospers separated from the other. The pastor by confining his care to his sermons, may make them better than they would be otherwise, as specimens of preaching at large, but it is the pastoral care in the breadth and fullness of its applications, that helps him "on to perfection" in making sermons for his parish. He must keep himself acquainted, as perfectly as possible, with the wants and changes of his flock, which are not the same always; he must be inspired in his preaching by sympathizing with it, and other things not wanting the measure of this inspiration, measures his pulpit proficiency.

15—*Another condition of his progress, one of which the fulfilment of the former is a necessary means, though not of course duly conjoined with it, is diligence in replenishing his Pulpit Fund.* Out of this fund he should be continually bringing forth in his ministry things new as well as old. There must be variety, there must be novelty in his preaching; and to this end, he cannot be too vigilant, too thoughtful, too provident, too economical of time and opportunity. He will need increase of general learning; he will need continued intellectual culture; he will need especially, perpetual wide-awake observation, and husbandry of topics, and judgment and thrift in using them. Pulpit exigency must be constantly in his thought; in his reading; his studies; his prayers; his parochial occupations, conferences, visitations; in his retirements, and in his recreations. If he relaxes his vigilance, it must be in order to his exercising it better. Subserviency to provision for his Pulpit work must pervade and regulate his whole life.

16—*A third necessity: He must assiduously cultivate his preaching talent; "neglect not the gift that is in him:"* precious

beyond price, it is yet not self-conservative, much less self-progressive. There is a principle of growth, there is vital force in it, but it will not grow, it is liable to be blighted and even killed by neglect. Men with excellent preaching ability, at their beginning in the ministry, have lost it from not disciplining and training it. Perhaps they kept up mental discipline in general, and made good progress in learning, and became strong for other work ; but as for preaching, the very inclination for it forsook them : Means of general improvement will not suffice for improvement in preaching. It demands appliances for cultivating, directly and specifically, the talent for the work.

And what are they ? Several might be insisted on ; the study of the principles and models of Pulpit eloquence, the study of Pulpit elocution and delivery, etc. ; but there is one,—one which virtually includes every other, and without which every other will be of small avail ; namely, *artistic practice*, the aiming at ideal excellence in the work ; the performing it as a mental gymnastic. There is no true growth in mind, except from athletic self-exertion. It is not advanced by doing less than its best ; it may lose, it cannot gain by voluntary short coming. This is a law of our mental constitution indefeasable and inviolable, in nothing more than in preaching.

An advancing preacher is one who struggles for perfection in pulpit labor : This labor has not the same form always ; it sometimes accomplishes a homily, or an exhortation, or a paraphrase ; its standard of merit varies with the sort of work it undertakes ; but it should come up to its standard. If however, it be delinquent in its easier performances, it must serve the Parish with its best, or at least intend and endeavor to do this, in those of the highest class. These, in all respects, should as far as possible, have a model stamp, an ideal finish. They will not on that account, be less acceptable to the Parish ; on the contrary, they will doubtless be an immediate treasure to it in proportion to their intrinsic merit ; but should they not be in such estimation at first, they will assert their real value indirectly, and durably, through their disciplinary efficacy on

the mind of the Pastor, and the enhancement of his general ministry. They will elevate and enlarge the fountain of his Pastorate ; and all its streams will be purer, sweeter, more fertilizing ; they will also be enduring ; they will flow in increasing plenitude.

16—*It may be useful as a means of improvement—to the highest proficiency, perhaps, necessary—to pursue the business in presence not only of the idea of the highest excellence, but of a personification thereof, in an individual example ; to preach and prepare to preach, as in the society of a man of exquisite judgment and taste, an accomplished critic of discourse.* We have this counsel from Vinet : “Have you an audience composed of forty-nine wise, and one ignorant ; speak for that ignorant one.” We agree, but would add : Have you an audience composed of forty-nine ignorant, and one wise ; forget not this wise one’s presence ; his judgment of merit in discourse, is the only one you should have respect to: and it may save you from faults ; it may energize and sharpen your speaking faculties, to keep yourself under the impression that he is before you : you should still consider, that “He who judgeth you, is the Lord ;” but though it is comparatively “a light thing to be judged of man’s judgment,” it may help you to speak so as to be better able to abide the judgment of God, to commend yourself to this man’s approval.

17—*And if this man be your personal friend, and through love of you, be incapable of flattering or sparing you, it may be an instance of your wisdom, to ask occasionally his criticism on your preaching.* You should not be over confident of your advancement, though you have assurance of the satisfaction of the Parish ; nay, though you have its admiration and applause ; this is a deceptive signal of merit ; it is generally the fruit of partiality or ignorance. You should not, again, be over confident in your satisfaction with yourself. A weak man, it has been said, can read a wise one more easily than a wise man can read himself. Though therefore you may “know nothing by yourself,” and perhaps may hear nothing to the contrary of your being in all respects, universally well pleasing to your

parish, there may be imperfections in your preaching, which some of the people may see and talk about among themselves, and which, if you were conscious of them, you might correct. You may be admonished as to some of them, by oblique, indirect, methods with a common member of your flock, with a simple parishioner, a poor woman, even a child ; but you need thorough knowledge of them, and the criticisms of an intelligent, frank, faithful friend, may be your only means of acquiring it. Avail yourself of them, if they are at your command. We are acquainted with a minister who regards his having had such a friend among his hearers, in the earlier days of his course, as an advantage to his preaching, for which he owes a debt of gratitude to him, too large even to be repaid.

18. But we have not completed the theory of advancement. The deepest, the genetic element remains to be examined. *This is the pastoral temper ; the stamp of spirituality proper to a pastor ;* that which keeps him at his point of view, under pastoral impulses ; that which having in its fullness he is filled with pastoral wisdom, skill, power,—in sacred phrase, *full of the Holy Ghost ;* of which, if destitute, he cannot comprehend preaching, or know anything about it, as he ought to know. We shall indicate its principal elements.

19. It includes what has been lately termed, "*the enthusiasm of humanity ;*" humanity, impassioned, filled with true enthusiasm, in the interest of itself, its highest interest ; temporal and eternal ; its interest as sought by Christ, and in Him and through Him, secured and actualized ; humanity in its every member, meanest and greatest, raised to its ideal glory.* This belongs to it, intuitively, from the *immediate* purpose of preaching which is "the salvation of man with eternal glory." Preaching is the ordinance of salvation : How impossible

*Eccc Homo, The scope of the author's idea of man's well being, comprehends, not "the good gifts of the earth merely," but "whatever cherishes and trains best, the Christ within man:" "the object of Christ's love for men in life and in death." pp. 180. 181.

* II. Tim. ii. 10

to be earnest without being *enthusiastic* in it. If in other interests one cannot be earnestly engaged without becoming oblivious of self; if a patriot-soldier cannot, in the strife of battle think of his life, much more cannot a leader of the sacramental host, in warfare for man's recovery from the power of Satan to God: Nothing is more inconceivable. This divine enthusiasm, in the necessity, the nature of things, possesses every earnest preacher so long as he is indeed earnest—under modification from his pastorate, it possesses the Pastor. Under the pastoral impulse, he has already virtually surrendered his life for his flock,* his interest in it is as nothing to him compared with his interest in their service. He is very imperfect, very variable, in the proper exercises of this self-devotement, but the principle of them lives within him, and will not fail to discover itself even in its extreme form, if in that form occasion requires its appearance.

20. But this passion of humanity, at its utmost height, is not the highest spring of the Pastor's activity. This lies in *his sense of excellence in the way of salvation; the scheme of Redeeming Love*. As a motive force in his ministry, this transcends the other beyond the reach of thought. It does so with reason; it is in itself "a far more exceeding" and powerful impulse. It is not, in the deliverance of man, but in the mode of its accomplishment, that the glory of God is most resplendently displayed: our salvation, by itself, gives exercise to but one of the Divine attributes; in *its mode* every one concurs in measure beyond measure. The mode, moreover, is effectual to other ends, besides its immediate one; ends surpassing whatever may be separately reached; ends involving in a higher degree, the happiness of all good creatures.† True preaching while in the spirit of self-sacrifice seeking its immediate end, is not insensible to the wider bearings and designs of this Deity of the Trinity, in the interest of mankind; Its supreme impulse is derived from reference to them; an impulse including

*See John ii. 11. Philip, x. 17. Rom. iv. 3.

†Col. ii. 3. Eph. lii 10.

the others but extending immeasurably beyond them ; an impulse unimpaired, still triumphant, under failure of the other ; an impulse to which despondency is inaccessible ; which, whatever may be the direct effect of preaching, causeth the preacher "always to triumph in Christ ;" assuring him, that he is "un to God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that perish, as well as in them that are saved ;" that "though Israel be not gathered, yet shall he be glorious in the eyes of the Lord."* Restricting his thoughts to the immediate results of his ministry he cannot forbear the complaint : "I have labored in vain ; I have spent my strength for naught and in vain ;"† he is sometimes pierced with agony in uttering it ; but by extending his view, by bringing himself under the illumination of the mediatorial scheme, "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."‡ he is more than consoled ; his grief is allayed by a divine gladness ; he renews his strength and courage in preaching ; he goes forward in it, still with fear and much trembling,§ as to its instant consequences, yet on the whole with irrepressible animation, rising sometimes to sublime and glorious joy. ||

21. As might be expected, since "the joy of the Lord is our strength," *the direct fruitfulness of preaching is large in proportion as the work proceeds, under the command of this larger, mightier, motive.* It is in this motive, not distinctively in the other, that zeal in saving man has "the hiding of its power." It gives the highest inspiration in calling sinners to repentance, and in edifying the church. It yields more success, in making converts and training them in the christian life. Were the salvation of his parish the Pastor's ultimate end, he should abide under the domination of this impulse. So we are taught by experience and the history of evangelism, as well as by theory. Whitfield's astonishing zeal, and corresponding success as an evangelist, is ascribed by Isaac Taylor, to his

* Is. xlix. 5.
§ I Cor. ii, 3.

† Is. xlix. 4.

‡ II Cor. iv. 6.
|| II Cor. iv, 17.

living in the effulgence of the mediatorial scheme.* There are other examples too many to be all cited. Let two more suffice. The soul of Paul, the most celebrated model among human preachers, "existed," says Taylor, "in the very blaze of that glory which surrounds the mediatorial scheme." He was, doubtless, distinguished in this respect, less only than ONE other; he had like pre-eminence in laboring as a preacher; as to his success, there is no parallel to it in Christian history. But a greater than Paul, is the other instance. The Saviour of mankind who died for us all, the Divine ideal of the enthusiasm of humanity, fulfilled his ministry of unsearchable love to man under the influence of an enthusiasm, if we may so name it now, which had its fountain in a sphere in which greater interests have place than those exclusively of mankind. He sacrificed himself for our sake; his preaching was an earnest overture of salvation, but it had an infinitely wider scope, comprising the ultimate honors and triumphs of his mediation in behalf of man. He wept over those to whom his preaching was unavailing;† but his tears did not save them; there was no forgiveness for them; their contempt of the all-glorious plan of redemption, was avenged by their aggravated destruction. His own regard to the Divine glory as concerned in his mediation was supreme. It dominated his whole ministry, as it has all the counsels and acts of the divine government of the world, and will dominate the proceedings and issues of eternal judgment.

22. In the whole and in each one of the elements of this imperial motive, there is a preaching force, which only consciousness can understand; but there is one of its elements, which our analysis ought not to omit: from its special influence on preaching, it deserves special emphasis. *It is, distinctively, the conscious counterpart in the preacher of the Divine Love*

* Wesley and Methodism. Let the reader turn to the section of this book, entitled, "The fourth element of Methodism." We have seldom read a more interesting work than this; the whole is admirable, but the section we have referred to, is, we think, chief in importance

† Luke xix, 41.

which was the Spring-head, and the Efficient of the Device of Redemption : Love alike inherent in the entire Trinity, but, in its several offices, personally actualized by the Eternal Son. The gospel history is the record of its manifestations: and this history, made reality in the soul of the preacher, is the objective cause of the impulse referred to. The impulse, a sense of love to Christ, responsive to his love in working out our redemption: love terminating on the glories of his character, as exhibited in accomplishing this work; and sympathizing with Him, in its several functions of self-sacrifice: love unutterable in its desire for supreme, adoring, universal praise to the name of Christ. As pre-eminently a preaching impulse, it has distinct authentication; † it constrains the true pastor in all his pastoral labors; its normal expression is feeding the sheep, the lambs of Christ; ‡ his preaching especially will bear the impress of it: it will perform all its functions as a tribute of supreme affection to the name of the Lord Jesus.*

23. We must by no means end our analysis, without emphasising another of the components of pastoral spirituality, *the proper counterpart in the preacher's soul, of the fact, that he is a worker together with the Spirit of God.*§ The union of the Divine with the Human in our religion is not restricted to Christ's personality; in this alone, it is hypostatic, but it is essential and real, in every movement and exercise of spiritual life. In keeping with the high spirituality of the work, it is highly special, in preaching. In this, the Holy spirit worketh

* As in the following instance: "amidst the dead and the dying, nothing can be more apparently prosperous to the church, than the overwhelmings now taking place in the earth. Christ will find his way to the hearts of men, and there will be a great company to praise Him. I know not why we should wish to be saved, but for this purpose, or why but for this purpose we should desire the conversion of Heathens, Turks, and Infidels. To find them at the feet of Jesus will be a lovely sight. Our feeble voices cannot praise Him much: we shall be glad to see them clapping their hands and casting their crowns before Him; for all in heaven and earth cannot sufficiently praise Him. I see no cause to wish for anything but the advancement of that knowledge by which there is some accession of praise to His holy and blessed Name.—Henry Martyn's Memoir, pp. 254-255.

† II Cor. iv, 14

‡ John xxi, 15-17.

§ II Cor. iii, 1.

mightily, and the preacher worketh according to the working of the Spirit within him.* And in the preacher, in his proper habit of soul, it cannot but be, that this law of co-operation between himself and the Holy Spirit will be imperative : it will assert itself in his consciousness. He will not, it is true, distinguish the Spirit's working from his own, for it is only through and in his own, that the Spirit does work ; but the fact of the Spirit's working, is a reality to his faith, and if a reality indeed, what must it be as a motive force ! With what awe, must it inspire him ! With what confidence, what boldness, also, as to the effectiveness of his ministry ! Assured that Omnipotence is exerting itself in his utterance, he is alike assured, that his utterance, though it were as the cry of infancy, must in reference to its purpose, be as the voice that called the worlds from nothing, and they came.†

24. Such are the principal integrants of the preaching impulse. Except in the Supreme Preacher, the Incarnate Word of God, its ideal has not been realized ; but to every true preacher, it is the standard of motive force, the measuring reed of pulpit excellence and power. More than upon all things else, proficiency in preaching depends upon its dominion in the soul ; and where its absolute dominion is not coveted, improvement in preaching is no longer an object of pursuit or of earnest desire.

25. *As to the amount or number of preachings in a parish: while the measure must needs vary with personality in pastors, and ought also to vary with places, times and seasons, there are principles in all cases applicable.* From the supreme virtue of preaching as an instrument of the pastorate, its potentiality should if possible be fully developed; the utmost should be

* Col. i, 29.

† " Oh I have seen the day,
When with a single word,
God helping me to say,
My trust is in the Lord ;
My soul hath quelled a thousand foes,
Fearless of all that could oppose."

made of it, that can be, without trenching on the claims of other work : There should be no needless abatement in it. It has its limitations however, and it must by no means transgress them; by doing so, it would itself become an eminent transgressor; a model of mischief making to the parish. And what are its limitations? These we answer : *The pastor must not outpreach his health; or by quantity deteriorate quality in his preaching, or require over much attendance of the people on his ministrations.*—Preaching may certainly be too much for the health of the pastor. Not chiefly, however, from its overtasking the voice, or lungs, or muscles; these are seldom hurt by frequency in speaking at the bar; it is from the much study, thinking, intellectual and emotional exercise, required in preaching, that much of it becomes a cause of disease to the flesh. But be the peril to health, from what cause it may, disregard to it, is without excuse : health has its laws; the natural consequences of inattention to it may be expected; they will probably come, and they may be without remedy: the preaching may be still abundant; possibly alike admirable; witness this, in Calvin, Baxter, Brainerd, Payson, and others. It is nevertheless exceptional in these great examples: generally its course is short, and the impress of ill health apparent in it, in inherent debility and lassitude. Unquestionably then, due attention to dietetics and bodily recreation, is imperative on the Pastor; it is one of the limitations of his measure in preaching.*—His next restriction is more serious. *The quality of his preaching*, nothing is permitted to impair: degeneracy in this is virtual degeneracy in the entire pastorate, and we

*The body on two accounts needs attention. It is a servant that would be master; and when it leaves the mastery where it belongs, it is too often wronged by the exercise thereof. After what Paul has said, as to his way of dealing with the body in I Cor. ix, 27. the Pastor should not think that he will have no occasion to use a like method with it—but let him have a care that he does no injury to the body, when not unsubmitive. He may do it wrong by other means than overtasking it. He owes it refreshment and recreation as well as rest. Let him not despise the body. He ought not to forget that though the Lord be not for the body, he may by neglecting the care of it, disqualify himself for serving the Lord; and for serving himself, as otherwise he might do in the work of the ministry.

have already insisted that preaching for its just culture requires the utmost care : still the necessity for this care does not absolutely conclude against abundance ; on the contrary, it generally concludes in favor of this. As with the exercise of other principles of activity, so with that of preaching, much, other things not wanting, tends to much, little to little, in result. Cecil thought he should lose his preaching-talent if he should preach but once a month. He may not have been mistaken. There is a principle of deterioration in infrequent preaching, even when not voluntary, or from preoccupation in other very good work. Eminent preachers have ceased from their high pulpit distinction, have scarcely retained an aptitude for pulpit duty, after having being transferred to the chair. They were good in teaching the art of preaching, but they performed the whetstone's office,* which sharpens without being itself sharp.—As to the remaining restriction: this infers of necessity, but a small abatement. Without requiring time appropriate to business or common duties, a pastor may keep at daily preaching, to the advantage of those who desire to hear him, giving the rest no occasion of complaint. A brief morning sermon may be a help to better living, in all respects though the day; nor need this complete the daily ministration of the word. The pastor without offending against this restriction, may follow the morning service, with district or domestic preaching in different parts of the parish. If there be objection to such frequency, it must be from the pastor's overdoing, not from necessary infringement on the duty or interest of others.

If now we turn for instruction from theory to examples, of these three classes may be distinguished: One consisting of those who take the minimum, as the best measure: another of pastors who adopt the traditional amount; satisfying themselves with what satisfies the parish: a third, of pastors who while keeping themselves within the proper limits, are yet instant in preaching, in season, out of season, laboring in

* "Fungar vice cotis"—

word and doctrine, day and night, publicly and from house to house; measuring amount in their work by the measure of their gracious ability. Which of these classes should be taken as most exemplary? The question answers itself. Intuitively, emphatically, the last is the class which commends itself as the model one; that in which is found the nearest approach to the ideal of the ministry, that in which the conformity is most complete to Paul's style of working, as reported in Acts xx. 18-20, and especially, in the 31st verse of this chapter. Here are the representative pastors through all the centuries; the best Parish preaching; the best pastors, in most, if not all respects, have been of the third class. It is the class, at the head of which Christ stands as a preacher. The typical excellence in doing the work of the ministry, is reproduced in this class, more than in either of the others. There may be in it, too many valetudinarians; there are also, probably, in both the other classes; be this as it may, it is to the third class that the pre-eminence belongs.

27. It has been objected to abundance, that it is necessarily wasteful, nay, even destructive of fruit which has been produced. If one sermon, it is said, be followed by others in quick succession, they will efface the good impressions made by the former. There is danger that nothing will be remembered, nothing retained by most of the hearers. The objection mistakes as to the way in which the hearers are profitted by preaching. The measure of their advantage from it, is not what they remember or retain in distinct knowledge. Neither are actual impressions displaced or impaired by succeeding ones. The good impressions are homogeneal; they are well affectioned to one another; they interpenetrate and confirm one another. It is the interest which the hearers take in preaching, and their mixing faith with it, at the moment of hearing it, that chiefly makes it profitable to them. It is not through their remembering what they hear, so much as through exercises of grace wrought in them under the sound of the word, that their edification is most advanced. "This," says Edwards, "may explain how simple and unlearned per-

sons may derive great advantage from preaching, of which they can give no connected account; while they have the help and guidance of the preacher, they get along well enough; when he ceases they have little to rehearse; yet it is not a little, if during the time of the exercise, they have been moved to fear, hope, love, or adoration." An anecdote may illustrate philosophy in this matter. A poor Scotch woman, at her duty on a bleaching ground, was asked by a traveler, where she went to church, what she had heard the preceding day, and how much she remembered. She could not tell the text of the last sermon. "And what good," said the stranger, "can the preaching do you, if you forget it all." "Ah sir," she replied, "if you look at this web, you will see that as fast as I put the water on, the sun dries it all up, and yet, sir, I see it gets whiter and whiter." It is well surely to be able to recall a sermon; a second benefit may possibly be thus obtained, larger than the first; but as Edwards has remarked the after remembrance is from an impression the words made on the heart at the time, and the memory profits as it renews and increases that impression.

27.—*Abundance in preaching if still true to the required quality, presupposes at least equal abundance in the preaching impulse; as a full stream flowing from a fountain of living water. And abundance in the latter is not of itself; it is of the Holy Spirit in the preacher; but the preacher has nevertheless an agency in obtaining and keeping it. He must use means to retain his point of view as a preacher; it will otherwise escape, and be lost. He must not assume that general spirituality will secure to him, of course, the spirituality proper to preaching. There is peril to the former, from neglecting the cultivation of the latter. There is a connection, an identity of essence indeed, between the two spiritualities; but as to form or exercise neither presupposes or produces the other necessarily. Eminently spiritual ministers have been little spiritual in preaching; and after preaching exceedingly well, from the true pulpit impulse, they have lapsed, not only from that impulse, but from their former measure of general spirit-*

uality.—Preaching in the proper exercise of spirituality, tends, it is true, to continuance and growth therein ; but this tendency may come to naught, if it be not promoted and matured, by after pains-taking to that end.

There are temptations even in high pulpit experiences. Model preachers have confessed to them. No merely human preacher surpassed Paul in the quality of his pulpit work, yet he did not depend upon it as a security even against *the loss of his soul*. He tells us expressly that he used special means, "lest," saith he, "when I have preached the gospel to others I myself should be cast away." 'But why marvel at this?'—Was our Lord himself negligent as to exercises designed to keep him in the true preaching frame ? In his human nature, even he learned obedience, through common means thereof. In the days of his flesh, he sought help from God, by prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, and was heard in that he feared.* We read of his great labors in preaching by day; we also read of his praying to God in solitude, through the live long night : Had these labors and this solitary praying no relation to one another ? Before and in his preaching, he was full of the Holy Ghost ; He went with this fullness all alone, into the mountain; had His occupation there no bearing on His public duties ? Being full of the Holy Ghost implies not the abridgment, but the absolute use of liberty; and what more unpresumptuous *than liberty at its highest summit* ? What reproof of their error, have ministers who rely for sufficient spirituality on the multitude of their preachings, from the example of Paul and others of less eminence; but how infinitely is the reproof enhanced and enforced, by the wrestlings of our Lord, at the Throne of Grace, in the cold mountain and the midnight air ?

28. We see in the light of the theory of our subject, another essential in pastoral life ; *a peculiar solicitude about the fruit of preaching*. Both as cause and effect, this is the inevitable, necessary accompaniment of the Pastor's giving

* Heb. v, 7.

right attendance to his great work. Along with the higher impulses under which he discharges it, *the enthusiasm of humanity*, keeps its distinctiveness ; has its just developments. Though of secondary order, it reigns in its sphere, without abatement or interference from superior motives. In the glory of the Divine Plan, supreme love to Him who fulfilled it, the sense of Divine co-operation in the work of preaching, there is no abridgement of the power of the passion of humanity ; the motives are all in the same interest ; they concur each with every other, and the whole with each ; as does the entire body with the action of each particular member. The whole, in combination, enforces the operation of the love of mankind. Sympathy, weeping tears like the Redeemer's, shed over incorrigible Jerusalem, is unrestrained, is intensified by the other impulses ; they coalesce and work together with it. See this, in our Lord's great example ; see it also in Paul's care for all the churches ; in his travelling in birth for the steadfastness and security of his converts ; in his great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart for the castaway Jews ; see it, to omit other instances, in him who wrote the Pilgrim's Progress. Speaking of the failure of his ministry in saving his hearers, he testifies thus : " I did often say in my heart before the Lord, that if to be hanged up presently before their eyes would be a means to awaken them, I gladly should be contented." In truth, nothing more impossible can be conceived, than a sincere Parish preacher, devoid of anxious solicitude about the immediate results of his ministry. The want of it, would virtually falsify the scheme of redemption, with all its wondrous means and ordinances, and stamp the preacher himself as a most infatuated, unhappy man. Before preaching, in it, and afterwards, the anxiety we speak of, cannot but reveal itself, with invincible force, in the soul of every pastor who is a pastor indeed. It will keep guard over him in choosing the subjects of his sermons ; in treating them ; in applying them ; all his work in the pulpit, will be ordered and performed with scrupulous reference to its proper end ; and it will be

followed up by means in keeping with this reference for securing, to the full if possible, the fruit of his labor. His love of life will not equal his pastoral concern. Being affectionately desirous of the souls for whom he watches, he is willing to impart to them not the gospel of God only, but his own soul, because they are dear to him.*

29. *It does not follow from this that he is unhappy.* Greatness of soul is not unhappiness; and there is no higher form of it than pastoral anxiety; in essence, it is fellowship with the sufferings of Christ. It is travail of soul like His, and it has like satisfaction with His. Its pains are not unprofitable; they prevent infinite evil; they yield infinite good. If they fail of their end in some, in others they gain it. They bless some of their objects; they inspire angelic joy; they more than content the Pastor with their recompenses to him; their fruit to him, ere they cease, is sometimes joy unspeakable and full of glory; for the happiness which he has from them, he would not accept the whole world in exchange; they are the witness of the Spirit of God within him, saying to his spirit: "Thou shalt be mine, when I make up my jewels."† They are a pledge to him from God, that in a sphere higher than that of the sun and stars, he shall be shining forever and ever, with a brightness higher than theirs, after they shall have ceased to shine.‡ The earnest of "the far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" has its completest development, in the proper exercise, and offices of pastoral solicitude. Happy, yea, happiest of men, then, the faithful Pastor. "Happy, thrice happy, if all his desire is to add some voices to the concert of the Blessed; and to remain concealed, in the universal joy, only keeping in his heart, the secret regard, and the everlasting well done, of the Master and the Father."§

* I. Thess. ii. 8.

† Dan. XII. 3.

† Mal. iii. 17.

§ Vinet.

ART. VII.—ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF EPISCOPACY.

By ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, D.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

Episcopacy is that form of church government in which Bishops are set up as distinct from, and superior to, Presbyters or other clerical officers. Its distinguishing characteristic is *the imparity of the clergy*. And it insists upon the three orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons.

If put to vote in Christendom to-day, Episcopacy would prevail by an overwhelming majority. Of the 335 millions of nominal Christians, according to the tables of the Statistical Bureau of Berlin, full three fourths are Episcopalians :—Roman Catholics, 170 millions ; the eight Oriental Churches, 76 millions ; and of the 89 millions of Protestants, the Anglican, Swedish, and some other churches. In short, at the time of the Lutheran reformation, Episcopacy was universal, and is still the polity of many Protestants.

It is likewise a matter of historic notoriety, that this system of government was in full and vigorous operation in the age of Cyprian, about the middle of the third century. Between clergy and laity the line was already distinctly drawn. And of the clergy there were three *Ordines Majores* : Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons ; and five *Ordines Minores* : Subdeacons, Acolyths, Exorcists, Readers, and Door-keepers.

It is claimed by the Roman Catholic Church, that all these eight orders were of Apostolic institution, and are consequently of binding and perpetual authority. The Anglican church sets up the same claim for the three *Ordines Majores*, but allows, or rather contends, that the five *Ordines Minores* are only of ecclesiastical institution. And in this more tenable opinion not a few eminent Roman Catholic theologians, like Cardinal Bona, Cotelierins, and Habertus, have concurred, although the Council of Trent pronounced in favor of all the eight.* The

* Sessio xxiii, July 15, 1563, C. 2.

five *Ordines Minores* may therefore be dismissed from present notice as not being an essential part of the Episcopal system.

It then only remains for us to consider the three *Ordines Majores*. As already remarked, we admit the present numerical preponderance in their favor; the universality of their prevalence for thousands of years; and their firm establishment as far back at least as the middle of the third century. But were they of Apostolic, or only of ecclesiastical institution? To this question we propose to give a careful *documentary* answer, for the satisfaction of such readers as may not have access to the original authorities.

We begin by assuming, what many Episcopalians are now ready to concede, that in the New Testament there is no Episcopacy. The Deacon there brought to view is in charge only of the funds of the church, and has consequently no properly *clerical* character at all. Nor is there any Bishop, distinct from and superior to the Presbyter, as appears from the *loci classici*: Acts xx, 17, 28, Titus i, 5, 7, and Phil. i, 1. So that with the exception of Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, who were for the whole Church and not to be permanently continued, the Eldership is the only strictly clerical office to be met with in the New Testament; and this Eldership is plural.

CLEMENT OF ROME.

Outside of the New Testament, our earliest witness is *Clement of Rome*. He appears to have been not a Roman, but an Oriental, and was, perhaps, a Philippian; but whether of Jewish or of Gentile extraction, is still under debate. He was at any rate one of the Presbyters of the church in Rome; the chief Presbyter, afterwards called *Bishop*. According to Irenaeus, whose authority in this matter is now generally followed, Clement was third in the succession after the Apostles Peter and Paul. The succession with the conjectural dates as given by Jaffé in his *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, was; Linnes, 67?—79? A. D.; Cletus (or Anacletus), 79?—91? A. D.; Clement, 91?—100? A. D.

We have in Greek an Epistle to the Corinthians written by this Clement in the name of the Church at Rome. The only known manuscript of this Epistle is the one appended to the Alexandrian Codex of the Old and New Testament, sent by Cyril Lucar to Charles I. in 1628, and now in the British Museum. Other manuscripts might have enabled us to decide more confidently with respect to one or two suspected interpolations, but of the genuineness and *substantial* integrity of the Epistle we are quite well enough assured already. It appears to have been in the hands of Polycarp of Smyrna when writing to the Philippians, was from an early date read publicly in the churches, is referred to and cited by such writers as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, and as to its contents is every way worthy of the Clement whose name it bears. Its probable date is 96 or 97 A.D. Near the end of the manuscript a gap occurs, where may have belonged certain ancient citations from Clement which can not now be verified. The Epistle, as we now have it, consists of fifty-nine short chapters, and was written to quell a discussion which had arisen in the Church at Corinth, where several Presbyters had been unjustly deposed from office.

The 42d chapter reads thus: "The Apostles have preached the Gospel to us by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ by the command of God. Christ was therefore sent by God, and the Apostles by Christ; so that both [things] were done in an orderly manner according to the will of God. Having then received their command, and being fully persuaded by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and convinced by the word of God, with the fullness of the Holy Spirit they went abroad proclaiming that the kingdom of God was about to come. Thus preaching through divers countries and cities they appointed their first fruits, having first proved them by the spirit, to be Bishops and Deacons over such as should afterwards believe. Nor was this any new thing, since long before it was written concerning Bishops and Deacons: For thus saith the Scripture in a certain place: 'I will appoint

their bishops in righteousness, and their Deacons in faith.”* This accords with the “Bishops and Deacons” of Philippians i, 1. Neither Paul nor Clement is likely to have omitted an intermediate order of Presbyters; and the only satisfactory conclusion is, that Bishops and Presbyters were the same. In the 44th chapter we read: “Our Apostles also knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be strife concerning the Episcopate.” Hence not only the appointment, by the Apostles, of the Bishops and Deacons already mentioned in the 42d chapter, but also the provision made by them for the future. And because of this Apostolic arrangement it is pronounced no small sin for us to “depose from the Episcopate” men who have worthily discharged the duties of that office. And then it is added: “Blessed are those Presbyters who, having already finished their course, have obtained a fruitful and perfect deliverance.” Here, too, the terms employed are evidently interchangeable, and Bishops and Presbyters are certainly the same. In the 47th chapter it is declared to be a shame, a great shame, for a church so stable and ancient as that at Corinth “to be led by one or two persons into a sedition against its Presbyters.” In the 54th chapter it is written: “Who then among you is noble, tender-hearted, filled with charity? Let him say: If through me sedition, strife, and schisms have arisen, I depart, I go away, whithersoever ye please, and I do whatsoever the multitude command me; only let the flock of Christ live peaceably with its appointed Presbyters.” And finally, in the 57th chapter it is added: “Do ye therefore, who laid the foundation of the sedition, submit yourselves to the Presbyters, and be led to repentance, bending the knees of your heart.” The Roman Catholic Hefele contends that amongst the Presbyters spoken of in the last passage the Bishop is included, since Clement in the 42d chapter, omitting Presbyters, mentions only Bishops and Deacons! This, of course, is sheer assumption. Only two orders are here recog-

* Isaiah lx: 17, although not in exact verbal accordance either with the Hebrew text, or with the Greek of the Septuagint.

nized : Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons ; and of these two, orders it is evident that Bishops or Presbyters are by much the more important. The mode of election does not now concern us, but it may not be amiss to add, that this also is disclosed by Clement. In the 44th chapter it is related, that the Bishops and Deacons spoken of in a previous Chapter were at first appointed by the Apostles, who afterwards gave directions with respect to future appointments, the *initiative* being assigned to the College of Presbyters, but "the whole Church *consenting*." So had Paul and Barnabas not "ordained," as our version has it, but *appointed* them elders in every church," (Acts 14 ; 23). In a word, the Presbytery appears to have filled its own vacancies, but not without an appeal to the Church to ratify its acts. Thus throughout do we find in Clement the original New Testament polity as yet unchanged.

IGNATIUS.

Our next witness is *Ignatius of Antioch*. Our accounts of him are exceedingly meagre. Whether Greek or Syrian in blood, is not known. Whether a disciple of Peter, of John, or of some other, is not known. Eusebius [Hist. 3:22] says he was second Bishop of Antioch, Evodius having been the first. The *Apostolic Constitutions* [7: 46] make Evodius and Ignatius Bishops together; Evodius appointed by Peter, Ignatius by Paul. Baronius and Natalis Alexander think they were Bishops together; Evodius of the Jews, Ignatius of the Gentiles. That he was a martyr, having been condemned at Antioch, and then taken to Rome to be thrown to wild beasts in the Flavian amphitheatre, is hardly to be doubted. The *date* of his martyrdom is, however, an open question. The earliest date is that recently giving by Dressel on the authority of a new codex of the *Martyrium*, first edited by him in 1857 (2d edition in 1863), which begins: "In the fifth year of the reign of the Emperor Trajan" [98—117 A. D.], i. e. 102 A. D. the old *Martyrium S. Ignatii*, which has the appearance of having been tampered with, names Dec. 20th, 107. But as it is now generally agreed that Trajan did not visit the East till 114, wintering at Antioch

114—15, critical opinion now inclines to 115 A. D. as the most probable date.

There are fifteen Epistles bearing the name of Ignatius, eight of which are now almost universally branded as spurious. The remaining seven [*Ephesians*, *Magnesians*, *Trallians* and *Romans*, written at Smyrna; *Philadelphians*, *Smyrnaeans*, and *Polycarp*, written at Troas] are in two Greek recensions: 1. the longer, first published by Pacaeus in 1557; 2. The shorter, first published by Archbishop Usher in 1644. Three of the seven, [*Ephesians*, *Romans*, and *Polycarp*] were published, with a translation, in a still shorter Syriac version, by Cureton, in 1845. Since then the Ignatian question, as it is called, has been opened afresh. The several opinions may be stated thus:

1. Killen, the Irish Presbyterian, thinks these Ignatian Epistles all spurious, but is of the opinion that the Syriac three were the first to be forged in the time of Origen [185–254 A. D.]; soon after which they were translated into Greek, and others were added before the time of Eusebius, who is admitted to have had the seven.

2. Baur and Hilgenfeld think them all spurious, but are of the opinion that the seven of the shorter Greek recensions were the first to be forged after 150 A. D., and that the Syriac three are simply fragmentary translations from the Greek.

3. Cureton, Bunsen, Ritschl, and Lipsius contend for the genuineness of the Syriac three. This, as the matter now stands, appears to be the weakest position of all.

4. A strong array of the ablest and soundest critics, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, such as Moehler and Gieseler, Hefele and Uhlhorn, may still be found on the side of the shorter Greek recension.

Dogmatism on a point so long and still so sharply controverted, would be unseemly; but as far as the Episcopal question is concerned, we need not hesitate to admit the genuineness and substantial integrity of the seven Epistles as we now have them in the shorter Greek recension. To make thorough work of it, however, we will first investigate the Episcopacy of the

Syriac three, and then proceed to investigate the Episcopacy of the shorter Greek seven.

THE SYRIAC VERSION.*

In the Syriac *Ephesians*, the "Bishop" is referred to, but no mention is made of either Presbyters or Deacons. "Forasmuch therefore as we have received your abundance in the name of God by Onesimus, *who is your Bishop*, in love unutterable, whom I pray that ye love in Jesus Christ our Lord, and that all of you be like him ; for blessed is He who hath given you such a Bishop as ye deserve."

In the Syriac *Romans*, Ignatius simply speaks of himself as a Bishop. He says : "Ye will not give me anything better than this, that I should be sacrificed to God while the altar is ready ; that ye may be in one concord in love, and may praise God the Father through Jesus Christ our Lord, because he hath accounted a Bishop worthy to be God's, having called him from the east to the west."

In the Syriac *Polycarp*, the word "Bishop" occurs four times and in connection with the fourth mention of the Bishop, mention is also made of Presbyters and Deacons. "If he became known apart from the Bishop, he has corrupted himself. It is becoming, therefore, to men and women who marry, that they marry by the counsel of the Bishop, that the marriage may be in the Lord, and not in lust. Let every thing, therefore, be for the honor of God. Look to the Bishop, that God may look upon you. I will be instead of the souls of those who are subject to the Bishop, and the Presbyters, and the Deacons ; with them may I have a portion near God."

THE SHORTER GREEK RECENSION.

The Epistle to the *Ephesians* contains 21 short chapters. Episcopacy appears in the first six and in the twentieth of these chapters ; the word "Bishop" occurring thirteen times, "Presbyters" three times, and "Deacon" once.

* As translated by Cureton, in his 2d Ed., 1849.

Chap. 1. "Well then, I received the whole multitude of you in the person of Onesimus, a man of indescribable charity, but your Bishop in the flesh ; whom I beseech you in Jesus Christ to love, and that ye may all be like him. For blessed be He who by His grace has made you worthy to have such a Bishop."

Chap. 2. "But with respect to my fellow-servant, Burrhus, your Deacon in the service of God, blessed in all things, I pray that he may continue to the honor of you and your Bishop." . . . "It is therefore becoming that ye should in every way glorify Jesus Christ, who hath glorified you ; that ye may be perfectly joined together in one obedience, that being subject to the Bishop and the Presbytery ye might in all things be sanctified."

Chap. 3. "For Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the will of the Father, as also the Bishops, who have been appointed to the very ends of the earth, are united in will with Jesus Christ."

Chap. 4. "Wherefore it becomes you to be one in will with your Bishop, as also ye are. For your most estimable Presbytery, worthy of God, is fitted to the Bishop as the strings are to a harp." Chap. 5. "For if I in a little season here had such intimacy with your Bishop" etc. . . . "For if the prayer of one or two avail so much, how much more shall that of the Bishop and of the whole church avail." . . . "Let us be careful, therefore, not to set ourselves against the Bishop, that we may be subject to God." Chap. 6. "The more any one sees his Bishop silent, the more let him revere him." . . . "It is therefore evident that the Bishop ought to be looked upon as the Lord himself." Chap. 20. "Obeying your Bishop and the Presbytery with an undivided affection."

The epistle to the *Magnesians* contains 14 chapters, in six of which we find Episcopacy ; "Bishop" occurring eleven times, "Presbyters" four times, "Presbytery" twice, and "Deacon" three times. Chap. 2. "Since then I have been judged worthy to see you in [the person of] Damas your godly Bishop, and of your worthy Presbyters Bassus and

Apollonius, and of my fellow-servant, Sotio the Deacon, from whom may I reap profit, forasmuch as he is subject unto his Bishop as unto the grace of God, and unto the Presbytery as unto the commandment of Jesus Christ." Chap. 3. "It becomes you also not to despise the youth of your Bishop, but, God helping you, to pay him all reverence, as I know is done by your holy Presbyters, not considering his recent ordination, but as men prudent in God submitting to him; and not to him but to the Father of Jesus Christ, the Bishop of all. To the honor therefore of him who loves us, it becomes you to be obedient without hypocrisy; since otherwise a man deceives not this Bishop who is seen, but affronts the Unseen. For conduct of this sort reflects not upon men, but upon God, who knows the secrets of our hearts." Chap. 4. "It is therefore becoming that we should not only be called christians, but be such; as some acknowledge their Bishop, but do everything without him." Chap. 6. "I exhort you that in divine concord ye study to do all things. your Bishop presiding in the place of God, and your Presbyters in the place of the college of apostles, and your Deacons, most dear to me, being intrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ, who was with the Father before all ages, and in the end appeared to us." . .

"Let there be nothing among you which can cause a division, but be united to the Bishop and those who preside over you, that they may be your pattern and guide to immortality." Chap. 7. "As therefore the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united to him, neither by himself, nor yet by his Apostles, so do ye nothing without the Bishop and the Presbyters." Chap. 13. "Therefore give diligence to be established in the doctrines of our Lord and his Apostles, that in all ye do ye may prosper in body and spirit, in faith and love, in the Son, the Father, and the Spirit, in the beginning and in the end; together with your most godly Bishop, and the well-wreathed spiritual crown of your Presbytery, and your godly Deacons. Be subject to your Bishop, and to one another, as Jesus Christ to the Father, according to the flesh, and the Apostles to Christ and the Father and

the Spirit, that so ye may have union both in body and spirit."

The Epistle to the *Trallians* contains thirteen chapters, with Episcopacy in six of them ; " Bishop " occurring nine times, " Presbyters " twice, " Presbytery " three times, and " Deacons " three times. Chap. 1. " As Polybius your Bishop declared unto me." Chap. 2. " For when ye are in subjection unto the Bishop as unto Jesus Christ, ye appear to me to be living not according to man but according to Jesus Christ, who died for us, that believing in his death, ye might escape death. It is therefore necessary, as is your wont, to do nothing without the Bishop, and that ye submit yourselves also to the Presbytery as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, our hope, in whom if we walk we shall be found in him. The Deacons also, as being the ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, must by all means please all." Chap. 3. " In like manner let all reverence the Deacons as the commandment of Jesus Christ, and the Bishop as Jesus Christ the Son of the Father, and the Presbyters as the Council of God and the College of the Apostles. *Without these there is no Church.* Concerning all which I am persuaded that ye are of the same mind. For I have received, and even now have with me the pattern of your love in your Bishop, whose very look is much instruction, and his mildness power." Chap. 7. " Wherefore be ye ware of such. And this ye will do if ye are not puffed up, and are inseparable from our God Jesus Christ, and from the Bishop, and from the commandments of the Apostles. He that is within the altar is pure, but he that is not within is not pure. That is, he that doeth anything without the Bishop, the Presbytery, and the Deacons is not pure in his conscience." Chap. 12. " For it becomes every one of you, especially the Presbyters, to refresh the Bishop to the honor of the Father, and of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles." Chap. 13. " Fare ye well in Jesus Christ, being in subjection to the Bishop as to the commandment [of God], and to the Presbytery."

The Epistle to the *Romans* consists of ten chapters, in only two of which do we find Episcopacy ; " Bishop " occurring once,

and "episcopize" once. Chap. 2. "Ye can do me no greater kindness than to suffer me to be offered up now that the altar is ready; that when ye are gathered together in love, ye may sing praises to the Father in Christ Jesus, that the Bishop of Syria hath found favor with God, being sent from the east to the west." Chap. 9. "Remember in your prayers the church in Syria, which, instead of me, has God for its shepherd. Christ alone shall be its Bishop [*ἐπισκοπήσει*, *episcopize* it], together with your love."

The Epistle to the *Philadelphians* has eleven chapters, in eight of which, besides the salutation, there is Episcopacy; "Bishop" occurring eight times, "Presbyters" or "Presbytery" five times, "Council" or "Session" once, and "Deacons" six times. In the salutation: "Which [church] I salute in the blood of Jesus Christ, which [church] is my eternal and abiding joy, especially if they be at one with the Bishop and his Presbyters and Deacons." Chap. 1. "Which Bishop, I know, neither of himself nor of man obtained this ministry pertaining to the people, nor for vain glory obtained it, but in the love of God the Father, and of our Lord Jesus Christ." Chap. 3. "For as many as are of God, and of Jesus Christ, are with their Bishop." Chap. 4. "Give diligence, therefore, to partake of one eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of his blood, one altar, as there is also one Bishop with the Presbytery and Deacons, my fellow-servants." Chap. 5. "Fleeing to the gospel as to the flesh of Christ, and to the Apostles as to the Presbytery of the Church." Chap. 7. "I cried when among you, with a loud voice: Be obedient to the Bishop, the Presbytery and the Deacons." "But the spirit preached, speaking these words: Without the Bishop do nothing, keep your body as the temple of God, love unity, shun divisions, be imitators of Jesus Christ, even as he was of the Father." Chap. 8. "But God forgives all who repent, if they return to union with God, and to the Council [or Session, *συνέδριον*] of the Bishop." Chap. 10. "Since by reason of your prayers and the bowels [of compassion] ye have in Christ, it has been announced to me that the

Church in Antioch, in Syria, is at peace, it becometh you as a church of God, to appoint a Deacon to go to them on an embassy of God, that ye may rejoice with them when they meet together, and glorify the name of God. Blessed in Christ Jesus be that man found worthy of such a ministry, and ye also shall be glorified. If ye be willing, this is not impossible for God's sake ; as the neighboring churches have already sent, some of them Bishops, and others Presbyters and Deacons." Chap. 11. "But concerning Philo, the Deacon of Cilicia," etc.

The Epistle to the *Smyrnaens* contains thirteen chapters, in three of which we find Episcopacy ; "Bishop" occurring nine times, "Presbytery" twice, "Deacons" twice, and "Catholic Church" for the first time in history. Chap. 8. "Let all of you obey the Bishop, as Jesus Christ the Father ; and the Presbytery as the Apostles ; and reverence the Deacons as a commandment of God. Without the Bishop let no one do any thing which pertains to the church. Let that Eucharist be accounted valid, which is offered by the Bishop, or by one appointed by him. Wherever the Bishop is found, there let the people be, as wherever Christ is, there is the *Catholic Church*. Without the Bishop it is lawful neither to baptize, nor make a love-feast [*ἀγάπην ποιεῖν*] ; but whatsoever he shall approve, this is pleasing also to God, that whatever is done may be surely and validly done." Chap. 9. "It is a good thing to honor both God and the Bishop. He that honors the Bishop, shall be honored of God ; he that does any thing without the knowledge of the Bishop, serves the Devil." Chap. 12. "I salute your godly Bishop, and your venerable Presbytery, your Deacons my fellow servants, and all of you singly and together, in the name of Jesus Christ, and in his flesh and blood, passion and resurrection, fleshly and spiritual, in the unity of God with you."

The Epistle to *Polycarp* has Episcopacy in the Salutation and in three of the eight chapters. Salutation : "Ignatius, called also Theophorus, to Polycarp, Bishop of the Church of the *Smyrnaeans*" etc. Chap. 5. "If he (the celibate, of whom

he had been speaking) boast, he is lost; and if he would be more esteemed than the Bishop, he is ruined. It is becoming to men and women who marry, that they marry with the consent of the Bishop, that their marriage may be in God and not in lust." Chap. 6. "Look to the Bishop that God may look upon you. My life be instead of their lives who submit themselves to the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons; and may I have part with them in God." Chap. 8. "I pray ye may always be strong in our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom may you abide in the unity of God and the Bishop."

Such are the passages. Those who accept only the shorter Syriac version, still do not get rid of Episcopacy, for the word "Bishop" occurs in all the Epistles, and in the Epistle to *Poly-carp* the three orders are named. With respect to the Episcopacy of the shorter Greek recension, we remark:

1. It is *excessive*. In these seven Epistles, "Bishops" are named at least 58 times; "Presbyters" or "Presbyteries" 23 times; and "Deacons," 16 times. Such abundance and superabundance of reiteration seems unnatural, and makes irresistibly the impression of some special design. The first suspicion might well be that of forgery, or at least of such large interpolation as to render the documents in question comparatively worthless. But admitting the genuineness and substantial integrity of the epistles, this strong infusion of Episcopacy is best explained by supposing it to be a new thing, which Ignatius was doing, always and everywhere, his utmost to recommend. As special pleading for a novelty, the Episcopal tone of the Ignatian epistles is easily understood.

2. The Ignatian Episcopacy is not diocesan, but *Congregational*. Each of the churches addressed had its own Bishop, board of Presbyters, and Deacons.

3. The Apostolic succession is not Episcopal, but *Presbyterian*. Always the Bishop is the representative of Christ, as Christ is of the Father; the Presbyters of the Apostles; and the Deacons, of the precept or commandment of Christ.

In short, the Ignatian Episcopacy, instead of having the appearance of a settled polity, handed down from the Apos-

ties, has the appearance of being a new and growing institution, unlike what went before, as well as what was coming after it.

IRENÆUS.

Our next witness is *Irenæus of Gaul*. He was of Greek parentage, born, probably, in Smyrna, about 140 A. D. He was a pupil of Polycarp, who suffered martyrdom in 167. From Asia Minor he was sent as a Presbyter to Lyons, in Gaul, where he witnessed the frightful persecution of 177 A. D. In 178 he was made Bishop in place of Photinus, who had suffered martyrdom the year before. In 202 Irenæus himself underwent martyrdom. His principal work, the *Adversus Hæreses*, appears to have been written between the years 182—188 A. D. This work, as its name imports, has to do mainly with doctrine, touching only incidentally upon matters pertaining to polity. Our citations are from *Stieren's* edition, Leipsic, 1853.

Irenæus commonly uses the words "Bishop," "Episcopal" and "Episcopate" in the Ignatian, congregational sense. As in *Adv. Hæer.* 1: 27: 1, where Hyginus is spoken of as holding "the ninth [or eighth] place in the *Episcopal succession* from the Apostles." As in 3: 3: 1. where he speaks of "those who had by the Apostles been appointed Bishops in the church." As in 3: 3: 3. where he says "the blessed Apostles [Peter and Paul] gave the Episcopate to Linus." As in 4: 33: 8, where he speaks of "the succession of Bishops" in divers parts of the world. As also in 5: 20: 1, where he speaks of "the Bishops to whom the Apostles delivered Churches." Irenæus likewise distinguishes between Bishops and Presbyters; as in *Adv. Hæer.* 3: 14: 2, where he refers to the convocation "at Miletus of Bishops and Presbyters from Ephesus and neighboring cities."

But in other passages, Irenæus unquestionably uses the words Bishop and Presbyter interchangeably, just as Clement of Rome does. In *Adv. Hæer.* 5: 20: 2, he speaks of those who turn their backs upon the teaching of the church,

"charging the holy Presbyters with ignorance;" not mentioning Bishops, who are commonly made the guardians of orthodoxy. Eusebius [Hist. 5: 24] quotes from a letter written to Victor of Rome [190?—202 A. D.] by Irenaeus, in which he speaks of "those Presbyters who governed the Church before Soter, and over which you now preside, I mean Anicetus and Pius, Hyginus with Telesphorus and Xystus;" naming, in short, the very men elsewhere called "Bishops." [Third of the 51 Fragments edited by Stieren, vol. 1. pp. 824—827.] And, finally, in *Adv. Haer.* 4: 26: 2, Irenaeus says: "Wherefore these who are in the Church ought to be obedient to the Presbyters, who are successors of the Apostles, as we have shown; who along with the *Episcopal succession* [episcopatus successione], have received the sure gift of truth according to the will of the Father."

This is just what our theory of the development of Episcopacy would lead us to expect. The predominant usage witnesses for the polity then actually existing as Episcopal; while the wavering terminology of Irenaeus is indicative, not of Apostolic tradition, but of later genesis and growth, and that growth not yet completed.

TERTULLIAN.

Our next witness is *Tertullian of Carthage*. Latin was his native tongue, his father being a Roman centurion. He was born in 160 A. D., was converted about 196, fell off into the Montanistic schism about 201, and died perhaps as late as 240, though his writings date near the year 200, some of them a little before, and others a little after.

In the writings of Tertullian, we begin to feel the ground firm underneath our feet. Words that were formerly employed interchangeably, or loosely, are now restrained and fixed in their signification. The line is clearly drawn between clergy and laity; as in the *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, § 41 where it is made a matter of grave complaint against heretics,

that "they bestow the priestly offices even upon laymen."* In the *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, § 7, it is admitted in accordance with Rev. i : 6, that all Christians are priests ; and yet, "the difference between clergy and people" is recognized as established by "church authority."† The three orders are frequently referred to, and always with discrimination. In one place, *De Praes. Haer.* § 41, mention is made for the first time of the new order of "Reader." The clergy are all "Priests ;" the Bishop being "High Priest," *Summus Sacerdos*. The Pagan title of *Pontifex Maximus*, in *Depudicitia*, § 1, is applied sarcastically to the Bishop of Rome, who had taken ground against the strictness of the Montanistic discipline. In the *De Praes. Haer.* § 32, as also in the *De Pudicitia* at large, Bishops are recognized as successors of the Apostles, though in reference only to doctrine, not in reference to spiritual power. With respect to the sacraments, while the inherent right of laymen to administer them is maintained, only Bishops, or their immediate representatives, are allowed to do it. In the *De Baptismo*, § 17, it is said : "The right of administering baptism belongs to the Chief Priest, who is the Bishop, and then to the Presbyters and Deacons, but *not without the authority of the Bishop*, for the honor of the church, which being preserved, peace is preserved." "The Sacrament of the Eucharist," it is said in the *De Corona*, § 3, is received by Christians at their "meetings before day-light," but "only from the hands of the Bishops" (*Praesidentium*).

In spite of the concessions here made to ideas and usages more accordant, in our judgment, with Apostolic teachings and example, there is yet no hesitation in accepting the Episcopal regimen. Evidently this had become the established polity. The maturity of the system is indicated by entire steadiness in the use of terms.

* Nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.

† Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas.

‡ See also *De Monogamia*, § 12.

CYPRIAN.

This eminent Church Father was also of Carthage, born there about 200 A. D.; was converted in 246, made Presbyter in 247, Bishop in 248, and suffered martyrdom in 258 A. D.

Two errors have been committed in dealing with Cyprian: (1.) In attributing too much to his individual influence in the development of Episcopacy. He was, indeed, a man of very positive convictions, and of rare force of character, called upon to play his part in very critical times. But Episcopacy, as we have just seen in the writings of Tertullian, was already so far developed as to leave but little for him to do. And the most he did was to add sharpness and emphasis to statements already made. (2.) The imputation, in undue measure, of ambitious and unworthy motives to Cyprian. That he was ambitious need not be denied. It would not be easy to find a man of equal ability, who is not ambitious. That he was eminently ambitious is by no means true. His piety certainly was singularly ardent. His loyalty to Christ, and to the Church of Christ, was a consuming passion. He sought for power, not in order to self-aggrandizement, but only to defend and advance the cause of his Redeemer. Soundness of belief, and sanctity of life, were the grand results which he sought to compass. He stood fast for Episcopacy, because he honestly believed it to be both Apostolic and indispensable.

The writings of Cyprian consist of a collection of 81 epistles (some of them to him), none of them private letters; and 13 Treatises, the most important of which, in this connection, is the *De Unitate Ecclesie*, written in 251 to check the schismatic spirit which was working mischief both at Carthage and at Rome. Converted as he was quite late in life, in the midst of a brilliant career as a rhetorician, Cyprian's earlier writings are wanting in simplicity, but he was not long in acquiring a more direct and pungent style. On the whole, the *practical* tone of his writings is one of their most prominent characteristics.

The Cyprianic Episcopacy, as it appears in these writings, has the following features :

1. The Church is one ; and church membership is essential to salvation. In *Ep.* 52, Cyprian speaks of "one Church in many members, distributed throughout the whole world." In the *De Un. Eccl.*, § 23 he speaks of "one God, one Christ, one faith, and one people." And in § 6 of the same Treatise he says, with striking terseness, that "he can not have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother."* But it was no doubt his belief, as expressed by the Cappadocian Bishop Firmilian, in the 75th Epistle, that faith saves without baptism, in case baptism be impracticable.

2. The line between clergy and laity is strongly drawn. This is very frequently done, but always in the interest of Christian truth and purity, far more than of mere Church order. See, for example, *Ep.* 66, which was written to enforce the rule, that clergymen should not meddle with secular affairs.

3. There are three Orders, of unequal dignity, and, to some extent, with distinct functions. Bishops are successors of the Apostles. This is insisted upon with the positiveness and energy of a profound conviction. In *Ep.* 27, referring to Peter's commission, as recorded in the 16th of Matthew, he says: "Thence down through all times and changes runs the ordination of Bishops, and the ordering of the Church, so that the Church may be founded upon her Bishops, and *every act of the Church may be directed by these rulers.*" For the Apostolic succession of Bishops, see also *Eps.* 42, 69, and 76, in one of which (the 69th), it is declared, that "the Bishop is in the Church, and *the Church in the Bishop*, and if any one be not with the Bishop, he is not in the Church." But though it be the *right* of the Bishop to regulate every thing in the Church, Cyprian, in the 13th *Ep.*, advises that nothing of importance be done by Bishops except "with the concurrence of their clergy, and in the presence of their people." For

* "Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem." The same idea is expressed in a similar form in *Ep.* 74.

himself, he says in the 5th *Ep.*, that "from the beginning of his Episcopate he had resolved to do nothing without the advice of his clergy and the consent of the people." Still, in the last analysis, all responsibility and all authority centered in the Bishop. He only could ordain, and he might both appoint and ordain quite independently both of clergy and people, as appears from *Eps.*, 24, 33, 34, and 35, in which Cyprian makes report to his clergy and people of such acts done by him. The right to baptize also belonged exclusively to the Bishop, as we find it asserted in *Eps.* 70, and 73, in the latter of which we read: "Whence we learn that they only who are set [as Bishops] over the Church, and are appointed by the law of the Gospel and the ordinance of the Lord, may lawfully baptize and give remission of sins." A similar declaration is made by Firmilian in the 75th *Ep.* with respect to "baptizing, laying on of hands, and ordaining." The right of consecrating the Eucharist, though not particularly spoken of, would, of course, in accordance with such ideas, belong exclusively to the Bishop. If Presbyters consecrated the Eucharist, and Deacons administered baptism, as we know they did, it was only under the direction, and as the representatives, of their Bishops.

4. Bishops are equal. Peter is only a representative, not an organ, of the unity of the church. Neither the Roman Bishop, nor any other, can be a Bishop of Bishops. In the *De Un. Eccl.*, §5, it is said: "the Episcopate is one, an undivided part of which is held by each."* In a council which met at Carthage in 256, Cyprian, for himself, and for his brother Prelates, repudiated the idea of "a Bishop of Bishops," adding that every Bishop was free to take his own course, and "was neither to be judged by any other Bishop, nor to judge any other." As for Peter, while precedence amongst the Apostles is, in many places, either conceded to him or claimed for him, his *primacy* is expressly denied. In *Ep.* 71 it is written: "For neither did Peter, whom the Lord first chose, and on whom he

* "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur."

built his church, when Paul afterward disputed with him about circumcision, insolently claim or arrogantly assume any thing to himself so as to say that he held the *Primacy*, and ought rather to be obeyed by those who had more lately come." In *Ep.* 73 it is asserted, that the power of the Keys conferred upon Peter, was, after Christ's resurrection, conferred upon all the Apostles. So also in *De Un. Eccl.*, §4, where it is declared that undoubtedly the other Apostles, like Peter, were endowed with an equal fellowship of honor and power, but that a beginning is made from unity, that the church of Christ may be shown to be one." In the midst of the above quoted passage occurs, in some editions, the famous clause: "And the *primacy* is given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one, and the chair one." But that this is an interpolation is pretty clear. It is wanting in the earlier editions of Cyprian, appearing for the first time in that of Manutius, in 1563; is wanting also in many manuscripts; was omitted in many of the mediaeval quotations of the passage which includes it; and, although retained by the Benedictine editors, is bracketed as spurious by Goldhorn in his Leipsic edition of 1839. And so the great Carthaginian Bishop, while standing up most stoutly for Episcopacy, was equally resolute in maintaining the absolute equality of Bishops, in the face even of the Bishop of Rome, to whom, in the 72d *Ep.* he says that each Bishop is independent of every other, and responsible only to the Lord.*

Now the assumption that Episcopacy, as it thus appears in Cyprian, was set up by the Apostles towards the end of their career, is not in keeping with the facts in the case. The tradition is, that the Apostles left Jerusalem soon after the Council in the year of 50 A.D. And it is commonly supposed, that most of them were dead, as the great leaders Peter and Paul certainly were, before the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D. But in the year 96, or 97, we find Clement of Rome still a Presbyterian. In the year 115, we find Ignatius

* The 72d *Ep.* addressed to Stephanus, Bishop of Rome.

of Antioch contending for Congregational Episcopacy just as if it were a novelty. Between the years 182-188, we find Irenaeus of Lyons employing an unsettled terminology. In Tertullian of Carthage, about the year 200, the wavering has ceased. And in Cyprian of Carthage, between 248-258, we find the system fully matured. Now these are tokens of growth, and are inconsistent with the idea of Apostolic tradition.

STAGES OF THE GROWTH.

But if the system was a growth, what were the stages of its growth? This question we will try to answer. Our hypothesis is, that the Bishop, as distinguished from the Presbyter, was at first simply the presiding officer of the Presbytery; and that in process of time, this presiding officer not only gained superior dignity and power, as was natural, but at the same time gradually appropriated to himself exclusively the name of "Bishop," which, in the New Testament, and in the primitive usage of Christendom, was strictly synonymous with "Presbyter." That there would be such a presiding officer, in whatever way selected, might be presumed: (1.) From the analogy of the Jewish Synagogue with its "Chief Ruler." (2.) From the necessities of the case. A Board, Council, or Session must always be moderated. And if there were such a presiding officer, especially if such by any other method than that of rotation (the least likely of all,) it is easy to see how he might presently become Bishop.

Such a development would no doubt be accelerated in its earlier stages by the sense of bereavement which came upon the Church as the Apostles and Apostolic men were removed by death. As the Apostles were mostly itinerating Evangelists, wherever in any case they did permanently settle, they would of course have Episcopal authority, and this authority would naturally be inherited, in part at least, by those who succeeded them. For example, James the Just (whether James the 2d, or a 3d James) appears to have presided over the church in Jerusalem for nearly 20 years, till he suffered martyrdom

in 69 A.D. John also was at Ephesus probably for more than 30 years, till he died in 99 A.D. And as the Apostles, most of them, went eastward, it is easy to understand why Episcopacy should develop more rapidly in the Orient than in the Occident. In its later stages, the development would be helped on both by persecutions without, and heresies and schisms within, driving the Church to a closer and more aristocratic organization. And it might be presumed, that the men most active and influential in this development would be the very soundest and best men in the Church.

That such was the development is, however, not mere hypothesis; it is expressly asserted by ancient writers. *Hilary*, Deacon at Rome about 350 A.D., in commenting upon the 3rd chapter of 1 Tim., in which Bishops and Deacons are treated of, remarks: "After the Bishop, Paul has put the ordination of the Deacon. Wherefore, unless it be that the ordination of Bishop and Presbyter is one? For both are Priests, but the Bishop is first; so that every Bishop is a Presbyter, but not every Presbyter a Bishop; for he is Bishop who is first among the Presbyters."* In commenting upon Eph. iv: 11, 12, he says: "At first all taught and all baptized." This, he goes on to say, was in order to a more rapid diffusion of the Gospel. By and bye it was found advisable to assign different offices to different men. Apostolic usages then gave place to other usages. "For even Timothy, who was made Presbyter by Paul himself, is called Bishop; because the *Presbyters oldest in office* were called Bishops, so that when one passed away, the next in order might take his place. And then in Egypt Presbyters administer confirmation, if no Bishop be present. But because *Presbyters in the succession* began to be found unworthy of holding the first places, the *method was changed*, the Council providing that *not rank but merit* should make the Bishop, many Priests uniting in the appointment, lest some unworthy person should by chance

* See Venice Benedictine Ed. of *Ambrose*, vol. 7, p. 345.

assume the office, and many be scandalized.* This translation of a famous passage, may, we think, be justified. *Primi Presbyteri* certainly ought not to be rendered, as Killen renders it, "At first Presbyters, etc." It might be rendered "the presiding Presbyters," but in that case the *sequens* that follows would have to be rendered "the next in rank;" implying a fixed gradation throughout the Presbytery, of which we have no knowledge. It does not mean the oldest in years but oldest in office. The oldest Presbyter officially was the Bishop, and when he died, the next in official age took his place. When this rule was found to be bringing unworthy, or incompetent, Presbyters into the Episcopal places, then the *ratio*, or way of doing the thing, was changed, regard being had, not to the *ordo*, rank or place in the Presbytery, but to merit. That is to say, Episcopal vacancies began to be filled, not by succession, but by election. *Recedente eo, sequens ei succederet*, might suggest rotation, but this would not agree so well with the context. The conclusion, therefore, is, that originally the oldest Presbyter [officially] was Bishop, and when he died, or was removed, the next oldest [officially] took his place; and that afterwards, Bishops began to be elected with reference to their ability. Such appears to be the testimony of a Roman Deacon, who was also a clear-headed and able writer, near the middle of the 4th century.

Jerome, [born at Stridon in Dalmatia about 340, died at Bethlehem 420 A.D.] makes similar statements. In his Epistle *Ad Evangelum* [146th], written for the express purpose of pointing out the difference between Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon, he undertakes first of all to show, that in the New Testament

* Ben. Ed. *Ambrose*, Vol. 7, pp. 283, 4. "Nam et Timotheum Presbyterum a se creatum Episcopum vocat; quia *primi Presbyteri* Episcopi appellabantur; ut recedente eo, sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Egyptum Presbyteri consignant, si praesens non sit Episcopus. Sed quia coeperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, prospiciente Concilio, ut non *ordo* sed *meritum* crearet Episcopum, multorum sacerdotum iudicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet, et esset multis scandalum."

Bishop and Presbyter are the same, quoting the very passages usually quoted in our day, to wit, Phil. i, 1, Acts xx, 28, Titus i, 5, I Tim. iv, 14, I Pet. v, 1, II John 1, III John 1, and then adds : "That one was afterwards *elected* to be set over the rest was for the healing of schisms, lest each one drawing to himself a party should rend the church of Christ."* At Alexandria this mode of appointing Bishops had prevailed, he says, from the time of Mark the Evangelist, down to Heraclas, [who died in 248], and Dionysius, [who died in 265 A.D.]

The exact date of this change of method, spoken of by Hilary, can not be given. But what Jerome says of the reason for this change, enables us to fix, with tolerable certainty, upon the second century, during which the Church was greatly disturbed by heresies, which threatened to result in schisms ; and perhaps we might say the early part of the second century. In the midst of this pressure and peril, the Church, instead of taking for her Bishops the men who chanced to stand first on the roll of Presbyters, had need of her ablest men, and therefore the Episcopate was made elective, the Presbyters choosing one of their own number to this higher office. This was the first stage in the development.

The next stage was reached when the Bishop, instead of being elected within the Presbytery, was voted for also by the people. Neither can the date of this change be given ; but it came about, probably, in no very long time after the Bishopric began to be made more important and influential by being made elective. It is enough for our purpose, that we have several well authenticated cases of Bishops voted for by the people in connection with the clergy. One such case is that of Fabian, Bishop of Rome, 236-250, as reported by Eusebius [*Hist.* vi, 29]. Another case is that of Cornelius of Rome, 251 ?-252, as reported by Cyprian [*Ep.* 52]. Still another is that of Cyprian himself, carried into office by popular suffrage over

* "Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui caeteris praeponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est : ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam rumperet."

the heads, and in spite of the opposition, of a majority of the Carthaginian Presbyters. The Cyprianic theory was, that the Bishops should be elected by the clergy, "the people concurring," or "in the presence of the people." But the Bishop's office had become important, and the people were often clamorous for their favorites.

When this point had been reached, the Bishop began rapidly to concentrate all ecclesiastical power in his own hands. Ordinarily Cyprian appointed no one to a clerical office without the endorsement both of clergy and people. But in several instances [see *Eps.* 24, 33, 35] he ventured to do it, and so paved the way for the entire exclusion of the people, which followed in its time.

This view of the matter is strongly corroborated by the rapidity of Episcopal succession in those Churches, whose lists of Bishops have come down to us.* For example, at Jerusalem there were thirteen Bishops between 116 and 134 A.D.; and in the sixty years that followed 134, there were fifteen Bishops. The rapidity of succession, it is true, was greater at Jerusalem than anywhere else; but everywhere it was greater than the average rapidity of the Papal succession. This view of the matter receives further corroboration from the difficulty of making out, as with respect to the Churches at Rome and Antioch, either the exact dates of the so-called earlier Bishops, or the true order of their succession. The rapidity of the succession would, of course, be best explained by supposing, that the presiding Presbyter was the one who was oldest in years; but may be sufficiently accounted for by supposing, that of "the first-fruits," or earliest converts, the maturest and oldest were taken for Presbyters, so that the Presbyter "oldest in office" would ordinarily be old also in years. The uncertainty with respect to dates and order of succession is explained by simply assuming, if it may justly be called an assumption, that no such importance was attached originally to the office

*In Eusebius we have lists of Bishops at Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, Laodicea, and Caesarea.

of presiding Presbyter, as was subsequently attached to the office of Bishop.

The appointment of Rural Bishops [*Chorepiscopi*], first mentioned in 264, in the Epistle of the first Synod at Antioch against Paul of Samosata, was in the interest of the original Congregational Episcopacy.* This was a mongrel office, neither Episcopal nor Presbyterian, growing out of the feeling that every Church should have its own Bishop. The *Chorepiscopus* might be ordained by a single Bishop; while to ordain an ordinary Bishop, three Bishops were required. And the *Chorepiscopus*, when ordained, was subject, very much like a mere Presbyter, to the Bishop of the neighboring city. The blow first struck at this office by the Council of Laodicea, between 343-381, was in the interest of Diocesan Episcopacy.

A noteworthy feature of this Ante-Nicene Episcopacy, is the smallness of the dioceses. Indeed, the original word for *diocese*, was *parish*; both words being of Greek derivation. *Diæcesis*, in the sense of "Bishopric," makes its appearance first in the fifth century, in the writings of *Leo the Great* (440-461), *Sidonius Apollinaris* (431-482), and *Cæsarius* (468-532)* Originally there were nearly as many Bishops as there were Congregations. For example Cenchræa, the port of Corinth, had a Bishop of its own. In Asia Minor, in the fourth century, there were nearly 400 Bishoprics. In 325 there were about 800 Bishops in the Occident, and 1,000 in the Orient, making some 1800 in the whole of Christendom.

But the hierarchical development, which we have undertaken to trace, did not stop short at simple Episcopacy. Besides and beyond this there were:

1. The special dignity conceded to the occupants of the so-called *Sedes Apostolicæ*, such as Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch,

* See Eusebius, *Hist.* vii, 30.

* See Suicer, under *Διοίκησις*.

Alexandria, Ephesus, and Corinth. But no superior *authority* was allowed them.

2. The Metropolitan dignity, consequent upon the institution of Provincial Synods, not far from the middle of the second century. Everywhere, except in Northern Africa, where the Senior Bishops ranked highest, the Bishop of the Metropolis of the Province presided in these Synods, and took the title of "Metropolitan." The Council of Nice in 325, which gave Metropolitans the right of confirming all Episcopal elections within their jurisdiction, and of convening Provincial Synods, only recognised existing customs.

3. The Patriarchal dignity, which was also in effect developed. The Council of Nice, in its 6th canon, only gave *express* authority to the Bishops of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch as Superior Metropolitans. Of course, the moral dignity was enjoyed before.

4. And finally, the Papacy itself is faintly adumbrated in what is said by Cyprian of St. Peter, and the Church at Rome. In the 55th *Ep.*, to Cornelius, Rome is recognized as the *Cathedra Petri*. And in the *De Un. Eccl.* § 4, although, as we have seen, *Primatus Petro datur* is probably an interpolation, yet *Precedency* is freely conceded to Peter, "that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one."

Whether Episcopacy, as thus developed from the time of Ignatius to the time of Cyprian, was a good thing or not under the circumstances, is an important question. Whether Episcopacy in our own day be a good thing or not, is also an important question. But neither of these questions is before us now. Our single purpose has been to show, by a candid appeal to the original documents, that whether good or bad, then or now, it is not, at any rate, of Apostolic appointment, but only a growth, the principal stages of which may be clearly traced.

ART. VIII.—NEW TESTAMENT ANNOTATIONS.

BY HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., New York.

I.—“*That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.*” I Tim. iii, 15.

The only weak translation in the English here is “ground” for ἐδραιωμα. This word is found only here, but the adjective form, occurring three times (I Cor. vii, 37; xv, 58; Col. i. 23), is rendered “steadfast” in the first two places, and “settled” in the last. Neither the noun nor the adjective is found in the LXX., but Symmachus translates the Hebrew *nekon* (Ps. lvii, 7, and Prov. iv, 18), and *makon* (Ps. xxxiii, 14), derivatives of *koon* (cf. γωνία, γόνυ, γένω, knee, knuckle, etc.) by ἐδραϊος. In Hippocrates the adjective form is used as an epithet of “sleep,” i.e. “a settled sleep.” The adjective is a rare one; and the corresponding nouns, as well as the verbal form, cannot I presume, be found in classic Greek, if we except Lucian (classic in style, but not in time), who uses the verb. The modern Greek has the noun, (probably from this scriptural use) and denotes by it a “stay” or “support” of any kind.

The proper rendering of the word would be “establishment,” “fixture” or “settlement.” It is an awkward word to translate, and hence the erroneous, but more easy, translations of “ground” as in our received version, and of “foundation” by others. A literal rendering of the phrase would be “the pillar and fixture of the truth,” which I take to be a hendiadys for “the fixed pillar of the truth.” It is a pillar that is fixed, firm, and cannot be shaken.

The chief difficulty of the passage, however, is not yet reached. The trouble is found in the assertion that the church supports the truth, whereas the truth really supports the church. To avoid this, a very harsh invention has been resorted to, by which the last clause “pillar,” etc. is made to begin a new sentence and to be joined with the next verse, so that we have, “The pillar and ground of the truth, and

without controversy great is the mystery of godliness!" Such an anti-climax cannot be endured any more than the unwonted grammatical structure of the sentence. I presume the main error of interpretation has arisen from a misunderstanding of the meaning of a Jewish pillar. The Greek and Roman pillars supported roofs, but the Jewish pillar either held up a curtain, or was a mere ornament. In the tabernacle there were five pillars to hold up the front curtain, and four to hold up the inner curtain or veil. These pillars could all have been removed, and the tabernacle would still have stood firm. In the temple of Solomon were only two pillars; these were of brass, 27 feet high and 6 feet in diameter. They were merely for ornament and symbol. Hezekiah overlaid them with gold, and then stripped them of the gold in order to make a gift to the king of Assyria. Afterwards the Babylonians broke them in pieces (as they did the brazen sea), and carried the brass to Babylon. These were called Jachin and Boaz. The former word, from Heb. *Koon* (mentioned above), denotes *firmness*, and the latter is from a root denoting *strength*, and these names sufficiently show the symbolic meaning of these pillars. According to the Hebraic idea, therefore, to be a pillar in the church (cf. Gal. ii. 9. and Rev. iii. 12.) is not to be a supporter of the church, but a conspicuous ornament, fixed and permanent therein. Hence when the Church of God is called the pillar of the truth, it is not meant that it is the foundation on which the truth rests, but that it is a glorious and fixed monument of the truth—a divine exhibition of the truth to the world. More than that, I doubt not there is here an allusion to the vision which Jacob saw at Bethel. Bethel is untranslated in the first part of the narrative in the LXX. It reads: "And he called the name of that place the *house of God*." So again: "this stone shall be to me the *house of God*." The place would be familiar to a Septuagint-reading person as "the House of God" (*oikos theou*), as well as Bethel. Paul says to Timothy, "The church of the living God is the true Bethel, a permanent pillar of glory, where one beholds not a mere vision of the union and com-

munion of heaven and earth, but the *reality*." What corroborates this view is the fact, that when the house of God is intended elsewhere in the N. T., the articles are used before both words. (See Luke vi. 4; Heb. x. 21; I. Pet. iv. 17. Also John ii. 16; vii. 20.) In our passage, the *omission* of the article *ἐν ὀνόματι Θεοῦ* is very peculiar, and is perfectly explicable in the view that this is here a proper name. I would then paraphrase the whole passage thus—"That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in Bethel, by which I mean the church of the living God, which is a more glorious pillar than that which Jacob erected, as it marks and demonstrates the great truth of reconciliation, of which Jacob's pillar only commemorated the vision."

II.—*"For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? and if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"* 1 Pet., iv, 17, 18. This passage is read and preached as a gloomy message to God's people, when the apostle wrote it for their cheer. "God is about to make terrible work with his church, and it will be a hard matter for a christian to get to heaven." This is the virtual comfort that most of our practical commentators bring out of this scripture. Their error has its root in an utter misapprehension of the words rendered "judgment" and "saved." The apostle is writing to the Christians in Lesser Asia, who were enduring their first persecution. The church from its foundation on Pentecost had been outwardly prosperous, and, with the exception of the Jewish outbreak led by Saul, had been free from persecution. When the storm, therefore, burst over the church in Nero's time, it was a new experience, and confounded many, who had supposed that the church would advance peacefully in its spreading influence. To the agitated and desponding Christians of Asia Minor, Peter writes. He urges upon them the example of Christ who suffered personal indignities and pains, and shows them that suffering for the truth is a proper sub-

ject of rejoicing. "He that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin;" i. e., any Christian in Asia who is seized and imprisoned is so used, why? Because he has hated and renounced sin. Surely this is a high distinction to be proud of. And with regard to those who had been put to death for their faith, there is every reason to rejoice. "For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." That is, "your dear friends whom the persecutors have put to death, received the good tidings in order that (although men might punish their bodies,) God might secure to them spiritual life beyond the reach of man to harm or hinder." Again and again, (vs. 13 and 15,) the apostle bids them rejoice, not only *in* but *at* their earthly trials, and then says (see the close of the previous (16th) verse and join the passages which our verse arrangement separates): "Let him glorify God on this behalf, that it is the time of the beginning of the judicial work from the house of God." This judicial work is one which separates the chaff from the wheat, and is the best thing for the wheat. It is a judicial work which only touches Christians in their bodies, but will utterly destroy the souls of the ungodly in Gehenna: "if it first begin from us, what shall be its end with those that obey not the gospel of God?" The allusion is very clear to Ezek. ix., 6, where the six slaughterers are told to go through the city after the man with the ink-horn, and to slay all whom the man with the ink-horn had not marked, *beginning at God's sanctuary*. There is probably also an allusion to Jer., xxv, 29: "For, lo I *begin* to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and should *ye* (the pagan nations) be utterly unpunished?" The marked men are safe from the danger. God's external church is sifted in order to its purity, and his true saints have no need of alarm. The enemies of God are the ones to be alarmed—the very persecutors of the Christians are in the fearful peril. "And if the righteous with difficulty *preserves his bodily life*, where shall these ungodly persecutors appear when God calls *them* to judgment?" God's chastise-

ments of his own people are slight compared with his awful judgments upon his enemies.

Such is the purport of this portion of the epistle. It gives every encouragement to a Christian under physical mal-treatment by persecution, and has not the most distant allusion to the great difficulty and doubtfulness of a believer reaching heaven. Christ's salvation is a *complete* salvation, and the Christian's entrance into the heavenly kingdom is an *abundant* entrance. Any notion of "scarcely saved" in the spiritual sense, is a reproach to the Redeemer. The "judgment" is simply physical suffering, and the "scarcely being saved" is from physical death.

III.—"Because that unto them were committed the oracles of God. For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?"

The English reader finds this a rough place, which the commentators very properly clear up by showing that by *faith* of God is meant *faithfulness* of God. The word *pistis* has not only the objective sense of *faith, belief, confidence* in another, but also the subjective sense of *faithfulness* to an agreement, promise or pledge. But the passage will be made still more luminous, if this fact concerning *pistis* is also recognized regarding *apistia* and *apisteo*. These, too, have subjective uses, and should be so translated here. Then we should read, "because that unto them were entrusted the oracles of God. For what if some were unfaithful (*ἡπίστησάν τινες*)? Shall their unfaithfulness (*ἀπιστία*) make the faithfulness (*πίστιν*) of God without effect? The first verb cannot be well rendered into appropriate English except by circumlocution, as "entrusted to their faithful keeping." A good illustration of the subjective use of *ἀπιστέω* is in II Tim. 2, 13, *εἰ ἀπίστου μὲν, ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς μένει*, (*if we are unfaithful, he remains faithful*) where the English version is again defective.

IV. "Out of Egypt have I called my son." Mat. ii. 15.

This is quoted by Matthew from Hosea xi. i. It is an exact

translation of the Hebrew. The Septuagint has the plural form, "his children," i. e. of Israel—probably to make way for the plural in the next verse. Calvin's view of the prophecy and its application to Christ is undoubtedly correct, that although in Hosea it occurs in a passage chiding Israel for ingratitude, yet it refers to Christ as containing his church. The abode of Jesus in Egypt was emblematic, just as was Jeremiah's journey to the Euphrates (Jer. xiii). It was an Oriental way of expressing the great truth, that the deliverance of God's people from sin is their deliverance in Christ. Israel's original rescue from Egypt was emblematic, and so is Christ's coming out of Egypt ep-emblematic in the same course of teaching.

Israel had three grand enemies, with many smaller ones. The smaller were Moab, Ammon, Amalek, Philistia, Midian, &c. The grand enemies were Egypt in the South, Assyria (including its successors, Babylon and Macedo-Syria) in the East, and Rome in the North. From Egypt the chosen people were originally delivered when they became a nation. They then came forth from the womb into full national life and full independent organization. I therefore take Egypt to mean ("spiritually" Rev. xi. 8) *original depravity*. Out from this state God leads his church and so—Christ as representing his church, (though spotless himself) comes forth from a sinful woman's womb. Of this escape from depravity Christ's coming up out of Egypt is a clear oriental emblem. As Egypt represents original depravity, so Assyria, &c., represent *retributive justice*, from which Israel is, through God's grace, saved as by fire. The Assyrian is the rod of God's anger. Babylon seizes, but gives up her prey. Antiochus scourges, but is driven off. Rome, on the other hand, represents *eternal punishment*. Its fierce hand strikes down utterly. It makes a final work and there is no redemption.

ART. IX.—THE KURIA IN THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN.

By DR. J. C. M. LAURENT.*

The ancient writers sometimes put the address of their letters on the outside.† Paul did not usually do this, he was accustomed to give his own name, and that of the person addressed, at the beginning, in the old style. But John probably wrote the address on the outside. This must certainly have been the case with the first of his epistles, for otherwise it had no address. His second and third epistles, too, do not have the proper name of the writer, but a designation of him as "the elder"—*presbyter*. They have no proper address, but introductions resembling an address; in which by the title *presbyter*, and the following words, "whom I love" (II John i,) and "the well-beloved" (III John i), the apostle claims his legitimate authority and testifies his love for those to whom he is writing. Short as are these two epistles, they were not private letters, but official documents, which the apostle, in his office as elder, sent to two private persons because he could not get access to the congregation by its regular representatives. He says, (III John 9), "I wrote unto the church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not." These words may be interpreted in three ways. Either John had written a short epistle to the church, but had not sent it, because he foresaw that Diotrephes would not let it come before the congregation; or, he sent it to the church at the same time with the epistle which he wrote to Caius (Gaius), but was in some way convinced that it was not received by Diotrephes; or, in fine, before he wrote the epistle to Gaius (the third), he had already sent one to the congregation, which had not been received by them, but kept back by Diotrephes. The last is the most probable. The verb ἐπιδέχασθαι, in III John 10, means *receive, grant access*; so too, undoubtedly in the ninth

* Translated from the Zeitschrift f. die lutherische Theologie und Kirche.

† See Adams's *Römische Alterthümer*, Meyer's German version, ii, 375, and the passage there cited from Plutarch's *Dion*.

verse ; and the apostle means to say, that Diotrephes received neither him nor the brethren, and did not even receive him when he knocked (so to speak) by a letter at the door of the church. For this Diotrephes, who was so strong and bold that he could "cast out of the church" (verse 10) members who received the brethren sent by John, was also in a state to send back unopened the letters of the apostle.

Hence, it appears probable that the apostle, who could not officially get access to the congregation, wrote his two last epistles, the second and third, both at the same time, to Gaius and the *Kuria* ("Lady" in the English version), so that in this indirect way he might work upon the church, by keeping up intercourse with its most faithful members. He exhorts both to be true and steadfast; the *Kuria* he especially exhorts to love, that is, to such a love as is shown in following the commands of God. To both he addresses himself by his official title (*presbyter*), leaving out his own name, because he was not asking for love and obedience to himself, nor yet to him as an apostle, but to him as set over the *Kuria* and Gaius, who were members of the church that was under his care. Gaius had already shown his faithfulness by receiving the brethren that had been sent to the church (III John, iii, 5), and John gives him counsel in respect to his further course ; but in addressing the *Kuria* he speaks as a spiritual father to a daughter and her children, showing that he has a personal knowledge not only of her but also of her sons, and expressing his great love to her and them. That the second and third epistles were written at the same time, appears from the beginning as well as from the close of each. So many similar phrases in so small a space could only come from a pen, that wrote two epistles of like contents, the one right after the other. As Jerome says, the two epistles are twins.

Luther [and the English Bible] translate, "To the elect Lady," following the Vulgate, which reads, "Electæ dominæ." "Elect" is here rightly taken as an adjective ; but taking *Kuria* as a general term (lady), and not as a proper name, can only be justified, when it is conclusively shown that the pro-

per name of the person addressed must needs be wanting. The reply, that "the name is also wanting for the *presbyter*" is insufficient; for the apostle, as we have already said, purposely left out his own name, so that he might speak only as the ruler of this church; while on the other hand, from the analogous Gaius, it is evident that *Kuria* must also be understood as a proper name.

The opinion of Jerome (*Ep.* [91] 123, ad Ageruchiam), that the "elect *Kuria*" means the whole Church, falls to the ground in view of the concluding verse 13; for the whole Christian church has no "sister." For this reason many have abandoned this view, retaining only so much of it as this—that *Kuria* stands for a *single congregation*. But this, too, cannot be maintained; as Dusterdieck (on the Epistles of John) has in part made evident.

How strange it seems to address a single church with the poetical *Kuria*! especially as this word is never again found, in all the Christian Greek writers, with such an application; although Christian writers and orators would willingly have adopted, by way of variety, some other term than *ecclesia*, if it had been sanctioned by apostolic usage.

In fine, if *Kuria* means the church, then the second epistle is a public letter to the congregation; and it is to this that reference is made in the words III John ix: "I wrote to the church;" for the second and third epistles were written at the same time. Does the second epistle, which breathes through and through such a spirit of love, agree with this position? Is it conceivable that John could have written such an epistle to a church, which had not received the brethren sent by him, and had cast out those of its members who did receive them?

It has been said that this epistle lacks all individual traits; but it seems to me that the motive in writing the letter is seen in just the address to the *Kuria*, as a mother, which is of the most individual character. The apostle desires to enkindle in the *Kuria* the flame of an active love: like Gaius, she is exhorted not to waver but to remain faithful, and not to let her-

self be led astray (by Diotrephes). Hence with great wisdom, the apostle makes appeal to her maternal heart. Can there be anything more individual than the way in which he twice reminds the *Kuria* of her children? How could he more wisely and heartily encourage the lady to whom he was writing (who was probably high in station and influence), than by writing about her sons, not merely in general terms, but telling her how he had spoken to them, and had good tidings to report! Those whom he had perhaps first seen with their mother as boys, had now again met in the vigor of youth or the maturity of manhood. Thus he speaks. Can there be more specific relations? This trait in the epistle is so taken from daily life, that it alone is enough to lead us to see in the *Kuria*, an actual mother of a family.

There are two reasons that seem to lie against this interpretation of the *Kuria*, although it is the one that would first occur to the reader, viz. the numerous children of the *Kuria*, and her unintelligible name.

The phrase in the fourth verse, "I found of (*ἐκ*) thy children walking in truth," at first strikes us as strange, and we are inclined to think of such a large number of children, that they could not be real sons of any one mother, but must mean members, or sons, of the church. But *ἐκ* conveys only the idea of belonging to, expressed partitively, not necessarily the idea of a large number. Thus John ix. 4, in the phrase "of the Pharisees" (rendered in the English version "*some of the Pharisees*,") the idea of *belonging to*, and not that of numbers, is the prevailing one. Another parallel is in Rom. xvi. 10, 11, "those of the *household* of Aristobulus," "of the *household* of Narrisus" (in the genitive with *ἐκ*); for here a circle is spoken of which at least comes very near to a family, and their number is not emphasized, but only the fact of their belonging to it. And it is not necessary to suppose that *Kuria* had more than six or eight sons, of whom some three or four were so advanced in life that the apostle might have found them grown up into youth or manhood away from home, with their cousins, for only the latter send greetings to their aunt through the apostle, verse 13.

But can *Kuria* be the name of a person? As such it has been customary to give it in the Latin form *Cyria*, or to leave it unchanged. Zunz (in his work, *Namen der Juden*, p. 15,) cites the corresponding man's name, *Kyrios*, from the tracts *Demai*, 7, 7 and *Shabboth*, 3, 3, of the Jerusalem Talmud.

But *Kuri'a* is in Latin *Curia*. The Greeks not unfrequently transferred Latin names into their tongue in such a way that they took the form of Greek names, and seemed to signify something quite different from their real etymology. The Roman name *Quirinus* (the governor P. Sulpicius Quirinus) is given by Luke ii. 2, as *Κυρήνιος*, as if the word were from *Κυρήνη* though the ancient Greek offered the forms *Kurinos*, *Kurunos*, and even *Kourinos*, to represent Quirinus; so that the usage does not favor this Biblical transformation. So, too, it has been supposed that the forms *Kuri'a*, *Κίριος*, must imply a reference to the common noun *κίριος*. But we are justified in taking these Greek words as simply corresponding with the Latin *Curia*, Curius, by a similar transference of the Roman name *Curio*. As this appears in Greek as *Κουρίων*, it will be allowable to class it with the man's name *Kuri'aw* which Pape gives from later writers.

There are in the New Testament several old patrician names, and our *Curia*, with her sons, may be worthily ranked with a *Junia* and *Julia* (Rom. xvi., 7. 15), an *Appia** (Philem. 2), a *Claudia* (II Tim. iv. 21). How many illustrious old names! It may also be, that names like *Julia* and *Claudia* were also borne by freedmen (Adams, ut supra, i. 76); but at any rate, the supposition is allowable, that *Curia* was not only a Roman citizen, but also of patrician descent; her sons, would then not only have inherited the honor of a noble birth, but also the praise of ancestors famed for courage and honor, of whom the poets had sung: Horace, *Ep.* 1, 1:

"Et maribus Curiis et decantata Cumillis."

And Juvenal, 2. 3:

"Qui Curios simulant et Bacchanalia vivunt."

* *Ἀππιανός* for *Ἀππιανός* is also found on Lydian coins.

ART. X.—NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

THEOLOGY.

The Rise and Fall; or the Origin of Moral Evil.—New York: Hurd & Houghton, 1866. pp. 311. The object of this thoughtful, ingenious and unsatisfactory work is to reconstruct the story of the Adamic transgression in such a way as to show, that it involved a "rise" as well as a "fall," a rise to "moral agency," as well as a fall into "disobedience." The same view in substance has been advocated by other writers of a very different school of thinking from our author; but without the specific point here made, which is, that Adam's choice really consisted in choosing a moral nature, or conscience, not having been provided with one at the start. Adam's choice, we are told, (pp. 60), "was simply his choice and reception of a moral sense, and the engrafting of the latter, with its opportunities and responsibilities, upon a nature previously *innocent*, but ignorant of moral distinctions." This we think to be psychologically impossible, and logically irrational.

The anonymous author argues, that conscience is "a separable and independent faculty;" and hence it might have been put into man after his creation. This seems to us to be a very imperfect view of the nature of conscience, and also of the nature of our faculties. The faculties are modes of action of the one indivisible mind; the conscience is not properly a distinct faculty, but includes those operations of the mind, which have respect to right and wrong. Yet, even if it were a distinct faculty, the whole notion that it could be made an object of choice, and as the result of such a choice, be implanted in the mind, seems to us illusory, not to say fantastic. How could Adam have chosen it, if he did not know what it was? and how could he know what it was, if he had no moral discernment? and how can a new faculty be added to a created soul, except by some sort of jugglery?

Besides, we do not see that anything is gained by this theory, either in the way of understanding the fall, or in the way of a theory in respect to the introduction of moral evil. It is a desperate hypothesis, which, even if proved, solves no real difficulty.

Orthodoxy: its Truths and Errors.—By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1866. pp. 512. Some Unitarians are fond of representing their system as the very opposite of orthodoxy; others are more disposed to seek out the affinities of the two, and to show that Unitarianism contains the real form of divine truth, which orthodoxy expresses in rude and repugnant formulas. The latter is, upon the whole, the aim of Dr. Clarke. He writes in an honest, frank and manly tone; and seems to try to extract all the truth which he possibly can from the old confessions, while still faithful to his position and convictions as a Unitarian.

As his volume goes over all the main doctrines of the Bible, it is of course impossible for us in a short notice to follow him in detail, or even to expose his manifest inaccuracies in the statement of the orthodox belief, and the vague and unscriptural character of the opinions he would substitute for it. On page 31 we are told, that orthodoxy "puts the essence of Christianity," in "something *intellectual*, which it calls faith;" and elsewhere he implies, that it insists upon belief in a system of propositions, as essential to salvation. But this is a very strange misrepresentation. Indeed this whole chapter, the second, on the "Principle of Orthodoxy," is exceedingly vague and perplexing. What are we to make of the statement (p. 41), that "belief has

no saving power, but knowledge has?" This is given as the author's own view, and seems to be very like the misrepresented notion of orthodoxy, which he condemns. We cannot make anything consistent out of this chapter.

His representation of the orthodox view of the divine purposes, that "it conveys the idea of God as pure will," applies only to a very small section of hyper-Calvinists, no representatives of whom are found in any of the living divines of our country.

As to the Trinity, he says (p. 439), "that no doctrine of orthodoxy is so false in its form, and so true in its substance, as this." He seems to adopt in substance the Sabellian hypothesis of three manifestations or successive revelations of the one God; and he makes the personality of Christ to be from and of his human nature alone. This idea is in advance of the Arianism of most Unitarians, and far better than the mere humanitarianism of others; but it is still embarrassed with the gravest difficulties, when we come to consider the relation of the human person to the Divine indwelling nature.

"The Life and Light of Men."—An Essay. By JOHN YOUNG, LL. D., (Eding.). A. Strahan: London and New York, 1866, pp. 497. Dr. Young was formerly a minister of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but resigned his connection with it because he departed from its standards, particularly on the subject of the satisfaction made by Christ in the atonement. He is well known by his "Christ in History," and by his work on "Evil and Good." In the latter he defends substantially the view, that God could not prevent all sin in a moral system. In the present work he gives up the doctrine of the atonement, as generally understood, and seeks to explain Christ's relations to sin and forgiveness in a more vague and general way, more in accordance with what he conceives to be the demands of moral philosophy. The point of view is distinctly ethical. His interpretations of Scripture are controlled by his underlying theory of a moral system and of moral agency. The book is written in a sincere and earnest spirit, but it fails to state the great mystery of the cross of Christ; it does not give sufficient weight to the undeniable Scriptural representations of Christ's work in its vicarious aspects and relations, and as laying a basis for our justification as well as for our forgiveness. The holiness of God is merged in the divine benevolence.

Life and Death Eternal: a Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation.—By SAMUEL C. BARTLETT, D.D., Professor in the Chicago Theological Seminary. —American Tract Society: Boston; pp. 390. Professor Bartlett has produced the best work yet written in reply to the views of Mr. Hudson and other defenders of the theory of the annihilation of the wicked. His argument is adapted at once to the demands of the student and the wants of the unlearned. His tone as a controversialist is candid and yet decided. The scriptural argument is presented with fullness, and, as we judge, conclusively. While the volume, by further revision, might be here and there improved, it is still a thorough and satisfactory discussion. A chapter on the natural proofs of immortality, we think, is a desideratum; for, the denial of the sufficiency of such proofs is at the bottom of a good deal of the exegesis of the annihilationists.

The New Birth; or, the Work of the Holy Spirit.—By AUSTIN PHELPS, Professor in the Andover Theological Seminary. Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1867, pp. 253. In this compact work, which is written in the style of sermons rather than in that of a theological treatise, Professor Phelps dis-

cusses, in five chapters, the Nature of Conversion, Regeneration as the Work of God, Truth as the Instrument of Regeneration, Responsibility as related to Sovereignty in the New Birth, and the Indwelling of the Spirit. The leading definitions represent the latest form of New England theories; but the abstract statements are illumined and relieved by a beautiful and forcible rhetoric. Even where we cannot accept his theories as final, we are still in sympathy with his evident aim, so to enhance the sense of guilt on the part of the sinner as to lead him to feel his entire dependence on Divine grace. Thus he says, the sinner "should feel that he is so overloaded by his own sins, he is so obstinate in his own perverseness, he is so prostrate in the helplessness of his own guilt and the guilt of his own helplessness, that nothing but Almighty Grace will save him. This is the measure of his guilt, that he needs Omnipotence to change his heart" (p. 101). "So long as the sinner will not repent without Divine grace, his dependence upon that grace is as perfect in degree, though not the same in kind, as if he could not repent" (p. 201).

In his chapter on the Instrumentality of Truth in Regeneration, the author seems to us to limit needlessly, and without sufficient Scriptural warrant, the Divine agency, by representing the truth as in all cases necessary to regeneration. This embarrasses and perplexes his statements, when he comes to speak of the possibility of infant regeneration. A chapter might well be added on the relation of the New Birth to Christ and his work.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Studies in the Book of Psalms, being a Critical and Expository Commentary, with Doctrinal and Practical Remarks on the Entire Psalter. By WILLIAM S. PLUMER, D.D., LL. D. Philadelphia, G. B. Lippincott and Co., 1866. The church of God will never grow weary of greeting, with heart-felt welcome, any respectable commentary on the "Book of Psalms," produced by a competent hand. Supreme in their intrinsic excellence, divine in their fountain, hallowed in their history, indispensable in their uses, exhaustive and unexhausted, bearing in their bosom the nurture and glory of the highest piety, sounding from their chords the minstrelsy of prophecy and history, of the kingdom past and of the kingdom coming, embracing "all the heights, lengths, breadths, and depths of the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian Dispensations," the most sublime and most ancient collection of poems in the world, antedating the earliest of Arabian, Persian, Greek or Roman, the gift of God and the sacred inheritance of the people of God,—any attempt to shed light on their contents, or commend them to the study of men, must ever secure for itself the attention and gratitude of all who understand their importance and value.

It is but small praise, after all, to say that this portion of the sacred oracles surpasses in literary excellence, the compositions of Homer, and Pindar, and Horace, and Virgil and Hafiz, and Manlavi. We can well afford to have rationalistic critics analyze and anatomize the Psalms as they would the productions of a Pagan poet, and exhaust their praise of the Psalter, by pronouncing it "superior to the Vedas, and the literatures of the East, and worthy of a rank above the classical productions of Greece and Rome;" the loftier praises of such men as Athanasius, who styled it "an epitome of the whole scriptures," of Basil, who called it "a compendium of all theology," of Luther, who named it "a little Bible," of Calvin, who declared it "an anatomy of the soul," and of the good and great of all ages of the

church, who have found in it the expression of all their emotions of warfare and victory, of fear and hope, of joy and grief, of gratitude and prayer and praise, and of submission to and communion with God, are of worthier note, as they are of more appropriate utterance.

The author of the volume before us began, eleven years ago, to collect the various accessible books upon the Psalms, for the purpose of entering upon the labor now completed. Nine years ago the actual work of the commentator commenced, and, amid the discharge of pressing and multiplied public duties, it has steadily advanced until his volume has now issued from the press. Its mechanical execution, its beautiful typography, its attractive general appearance—do great credit to the publishers.

The commentary itself is *unique*. Whatever of value, that has been written by the great and good, in all ages, on this particular portion of the Bible, the author seems to have laid under special tribute to enrich the pages and enhance the excellence of his volume. To the stores of his own mature Christian experience and research, he adds also, whatever of excellence he has found in the writings of others on the same subject, throughout the wide range of his reading. In this respect, it is without a rival. To possess the volume is to possess a library. If Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Athanasius, Basil, Theodoret, Hilary, have said anything good on the Psalms; if Calvin, Beza, Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Rivetus, Grotius, Musculus, Amesius, Cocceius, Venema, or the Reformers in general, have recorded any criticism of value; if Horne, Hooker, Dodd, Bates, Hall, Leighton, Lowth, Jebb, Patrick, Hammond, Pool, Gill, Scott, Clarke, Henry, Horsley, Morison, and others of like celebrity, have contributed anything meritorious; if Michaelis, Rosenmueller, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Alexander are worth consulting; the possessor of this volume will find abundant gems and fruits from all these and many other sources, gathered in rich profusion by the indefatigable diligence of the author. It is in fact a thesaurus of the doctrinal expositions, and a compend of the best practical and experimental thoughts, of the learned and pious, throughout the whole field of patristic, mediæval, reformed and modern evangelical literature upon the sacred Psalter. The work is indeed an orchard of ripe fruit, a garden of flowers, a mine of gems, as well as a memorial of the author's affection for the Psalms, and a monument of his untiring industry. It shows the high value the saints of God, in all ages, have put upon, and the universal love they have cherished for, the ten-stringed minstrelsy of the sweet singer of Israel.

In style, the work is terse, simple, forcible and epigrammatic. In arrangement, it is critical, expository, doctrinal and practical. In spirit, it is devout always, and impressive. Its general character is well described by the publishers: "Learned without being pedantic, critical and expository yet devout, doctrinal but not controversial, popular and eminently practical." No one can fail to be instructed by it. It will be welcomed in the family, in the Church, and in the Sabbath School. Other works may show more of the profundities and niceties of modern grammatico-lexicographical study, and make more parade of the apparatus of interpretation, but few have more of the true spirit of exegesis, or will conduce more to the edification of the believer.

He deserves well not only of the church but also of the world, who endeavors to allure the hearts of men to the study of the Psalms. They are the best educators of all the finer feelings of the soul, elevating and ennobling it, as no other than a divine literature can possibly do, not to mention their ordained importance as a means of grace and salvation. For in the Psalms, God has given us what even Plato declared God only could give,

"poetry stamped with the seal of authority, and in no point failing of what is right,"—a means of education the philosopher longed for beyond all the human poetry of the most gifted of his nation, but which he sadly despaired of, in his self-imagined polity of a perfect state. It is to recommend such a gift, peerless alike in itself and in its source, that the author of the volume before us has devoted his years of faithful labor, which ought not to pass unrequited. N. W.

The Jewish Church in its Relations to the Jewish Nation and to the "Gentiles." By REV. SAM'L. D. KERR, A. M., Cincinnati: Wm. Scott, 1866. pp. 237. The author of this volume has faithfully studied a special and important point of Old Testament interpretation and history, and has come to results which remove several serious difficulties in our present translation. He finds, by an exhaustive comparison of all the passages bearing on the case, that the Hebrew and the Septuagint, make a clear distinction between three classes, often confounded in our version, viz., "*the people of the congregation*," or the church; "*the people of the land*," those born in the land, whether of Jewish or foreign parentage, who were "the commonwealth of Israel;" and, "*the peoples of the lands*," the foreign born or the Gentiles. All of the second class, though the children of foreigners, could become members of the church by a godly profession and circumcision. The third class worshipped only in "the Court of the Gentiles." The distinction may be stated in other ways; a member of the Jewish Church—a citizen of the nation, and a foreigner. Mr. Kerr makes it evident that this distinction clears up many confused and apparently contradictory parts of the Jewish legislation. Among other things he also shows that circumcision was not a "national" distinction, but a sign and seal of church membership; and that servants "bought with money," were converts, descendants of foreigners, born in the land. The whole question of Hebrew Slavery is put into a new light. The work is worthy of careful study. If its positions are sustained, it will lead to a revision of current views on several important points.

LANGE'S *Commentary*, Edited by DR. SCHAFF. *The Acts of the Apostles*, by G. V. LECHLER, with *Homiletical Additions* by REV. CHARLES GEROK. Translated by CHARLES F. SCHLEFFER, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner. 1866. pp. 480. The publication of Lange's great work goes on with unflagging zeal on the part of the translators and publishers, and each new volume is warmly welcomed by the public. The most solid works are getting to be fully appreciated; and the success of one such work is, not a hindrance, but a stimulus to the success of others. This new volume on the Acts is fully as deserving of a wide circulation as that on Matthew; and in one respect it may look for even a greater demand, since there are not many competing commentaries of a high character. Besides, this portion of Christian history has been made in many recent criticisms, especially by Baur's school, the very field of new hypotheses; and hence there is the greater need of thorough study with the best guidea. Such a guide is found in the chief commentator, Dr. Lechler, Professor at Leipsic, a most worthy man, of solid learning, who, in previous excellent works on the Apostolic Church, has made this period the subject of special investigation. His commentary will be found to be solid, careful and learned, not vitiated by foreign hypotheses, and animated by a truly Christian and reverent spirit. The homiletical hints and analyses of Dr. Gerok will also be found to be, in the main, pertinent and helpful. The translator, Dr. Schæffer, Professor in

Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia, has done his work much better than the Edinburgh translator; he understands both German and English, and how to put the one into the other. His additions to the critical apparatus, especially from the Sinaitic codex, are of great value; and the notes selected from other commentators are real additions to Lange. He also does well in referring the reader to Dr. Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, which should be used in connection with this volume.

The Treasury of Bible Knowledge.—By the REV. JOHN AYRE, M. A., of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. New York; D. Appleton & Co. 1866. pp. 944. A very compact and convenient manual, well printed, and quite fully illustrated with maps and engravings. It contains an account of all the books, persons and places named in the scripture, with many incidental matters. The tone of the book is candid and conservative. In what relates to episcopacy and kindred subjects, it favors the views of the Church of England, yet not in an obtrusive way. Bingham is the author's great authority in Christian antiquities. The statements in different articles are more harmonious than they are apt to be in Dictionaries which have a large number of contributors. The later and larger Dictionaries of the Bible, and the recent English commentaries, have been freely and advantageously used in the preparation of this work.

The Minor Prophets, with Notes, etc. By REV. HENRY COWLES. New York: Appleton. 1867. pp. 424. Professor Cowles of the Oberlin Seminary supplies, in this useful work, a much needed popular commentary upon the Twelve Lesser Prophets. It is carefully prepared, and shows the marks of genuine study without any parade of learning. Every English reader can master all that is said. A new translation or paraphrase is given of those passages in which the common version is incorrect or inadequate. The exegesis is marked by clearness and sobriety. As to the interpretation of some of the prophetic symbols there will be differences of opinion. The second concluding Dissertation on "Two Millennial Theories" is instructive.

PRACTICAL RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

The American Tract Society, New York, is publishing an unusually large number of new and excellent works, got up in an attractive style. Among its larger volumes are a *History of the Huguenots* by W. CARLOS MARTYN (pp. 528); and *The Life and Times of Martin Luther* (pp. 550), by the same author; both of these works are well prepared, and give a good popular view of their respective subjects. *Bible Emblems*, by the late REV. DR. E. D. SEELYE, of Schenectady (pp. 222), illustrates in an eloquent style the force of some of the common emblems of the Scriptures. MRS. M. E. BERRY's *Sisters and not Sisters* (pp. 246); *The Climbers* (pp. 268); *Sybil Grey or a Year in the City*, by the author of the "Huguenots of France" (pp. 264); *Grace's Visit, a Tale for the Young* (pp. 231); *Lyntonville, or the Irish Boy in Canada* (pp. 183); *Among the Willows, or How to do Good*, by J. H. LANGILLE (pp. 128); are all well adapted for Sunday School libraries and general circulation. JOHN FLAVEL's *Jesus Christ's Alluring Love*, and CHALMERS' *Reign of Grace*, are reprinted in a convenient form. The same Society also publishes the substance of several admirable Sermons by DR. WILLIAM ADAMS, with the title *In the World, not of the World*; *Thoughts on Christian Casuistry*, (pp. 64): The motto from Vinet, "Love is the best casuist," gives the key note to wise and pertinent counsels about cards, the opera, dancing,

the theatre, and other worldly amusements. The same Society is also providing for the wants of our German population by the publication in German of a series of volumes; among the recent ones are TISCHENDORF's able treatise on the *Time when Our Gospels were written*; BARTH's *Hand book of Biblical Antiquities*; BAXTER's *Life*; Juliana von Krudener by W. ZEITHE; and *Songs for Sunday Schools* by C. J. HEPPE.

England Two Hundred Years.—By E. H. GILLET. —Philadelphia: Presb. Publ. Com. (pp. 363). No one is better fitted than the author of the "Life and Times of John Huss," to give a correct and graphic delineation, in a familiar style, of the men and times here described; Joseph Alleine, Richard Baxter, John Howe, and other worthies of the period of Charles II, are brought before us, living, and acting, in these attractive pages. The volume is well printed and handsomely illustrated.

The same Committee publish various excellent books for children; among them are *The Diamond Cross, or the Story of Florence Clifton*, pp. 222; *Flowers in the Grass* by E. L. LEWELLYN, pp. 214; *Jesus on Earth*, small 4to with eight illustrations in oil colors; and *Ram Krishna-punt, the Boy of Bengal*, also illustrated in oil colors. The two latter are a part of a set of five volumes, got up for presents to boys and girls, and vividly illustrated in bright colors.

"*The Omnipotence of Loving-kindness*," published by the Carters, pp. 340, is a deeply interesting account of the results of a lady's seven months work among the fellow-women of Glasgow, and shows what can be effected by Christian love even among the most degraded classes.

Nuts for Boys to Crack.—By REV. JOHN TODD, D.D.—American Tract Society, New York, pp. 267. A spirited series of sketches, with wise advice interwoven, in a style fitted to engage the attention even of the careless.

Recollections of MARY LYON, with Selections from her Instructions to her Pupils.—By FIDELIA FISK.—American Tract Society, Boston. pp. 333. Two biographies of Miss Lyon have not exhausted the materials for instruction found in her useful life. Miss Fisk was employed for a number of years in collecting these memorials, which will deepen the veneration so widely felt for the noble character and eminent services of the founder of the Mt. Holyoke Female Seminary.

Morning by Morning.—By REV. C. H. SPURGEON, New York, Sheldon and Co., pp. 408. A series of daily readings for the family or closet, each occupying a page, consisting of pithy and pungent, as well as devout meditations on texts of Scripture.

The Home Life, in the Light of its Divine Idea.—By JAMES BALDWIN BROWN, B. A. New York: Appleton & Co., 1867, pp. 327.—The ideal of a true Christian Home is well set forth in these thoughtful and eloquent pages. The family is viewed as rooted and grounded in Christ, and trained in his kingdom for his service. No one can read this volume without having his view of the nature and blessings of the family quickened and enlarged.

Heaven Opened.—A selection from the correspondence of Mrs. Mary Winslow. Edited by her son, OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, D. D. New York: Carter & Brothers, 1867. Mrs. Winslow is already known to the Christian public through her Memoirs published some years since. A woman of vigorous understanding, strong sense and ardent piety, her correspondence is eminently refreshing and quickening to the soul of the Christian. Like the

primitive Christians, Mrs. Winslow looked upon heaven as a reality—a near and blessed reality—she lived in close converse with it—and hence most of this correspondence.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

History of the United States, from the discovery of the American Continent.—By GEORGE BANCROFT. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1866. Vol. IX, pp. 506. This long expected continuation of Mr. Bancroft's great historical work conducts us through the most trying period of the revolutionary struggle, from 1776 to 1778. The exact state of the country is faithfully reproduced, and we see, more clearly than in any previous account of these times, what were the difficulties and struggles through which the nation, yet in its infancy, must pass, before it could become strong and united enough for victory. Mr. Bancroft has had the use of the most complete and authentic materials, collected from all available sources in this country and in Europe; and he has digested these into a narrative, replete with life and vigor, condensed and careful in its details; yet in the particulars he never loses sight of the great laws and principles, that underlie and shape the course of events. In the rare and high art of historic composition, he is a master, both in style and method. The actors and scenes are before us, yet not as in a drama, but as in life; and in life subject to law and Providence. It is a narrative of absorbing interest, worthy, to use the author's words at the end of his preface, to be laid "reverently on the altar of freedom and union."

The character of Washington, in particular, stands out in full and bold relief, in all its simple majesty, and invested with new lustre. For his unequalled greatness is seen also in this, that the more closely his life and times are studied, the more unqualified is the eulogium that must needs be given him. Even Marshall did not do full justice to his noble disinterestedness. Mr. Bancroft's investigations bring Washington's patriotism, his wisdom, his confidence in the success of the cause, and his abilities as a great general, into fitting prominence. It is greatly to be desired, that the historian of the United States might also become the biographer of Washington, and hand down to posterity the full record of all the Republic owes to him.

Besides the narrative of the external events of the war, brought down to the wintering at Valley Forge (to April, 1778), this volume also contains a full account of the political growth and consolidation of the country; chapter xv is on the Constitutions of the several States; chapter xxvi on the Confederation, which is admirably described, in its principles, and its defects. The progress of religious freedom is also signalized, and it is traced back, not to philosophical skepticism, but to Protestant Christianity: "had the Americans been skeptics, had they wanted faith, they could have founded nothing," (p. 274). The relations with England and France, and our national differences from both, are also set forth, in the two concluding chapters, in a bold and truthful outline, and with a thorough philosophical comprehension of the very root of the matter. We should be glad, did our limits allow, to make large extracts from these luminous generalizations. Luther and Descartes, both stimulating free inquiry, are, by a happy insight, put as the representatives of the two great modern tendencies; the former, representing "the method of continuity and gradual reform," the latter, that of "an instantaneous and thoroughly radical revolution." "The nations that learned their lessons of liberty from Luther and Calvin, went forward in their natural development, and suffered their institutions to grow and to shape themselves

according to the increasing public intelligence. The nations that learned their lessons of liberty from Descartes were led to question everything, and, by creative power, renew society through the destruction of the past. The spirit of liberty in all Protestant countries was marked by moderation" (p. 501). America "conducted a revolution on the highest principles of freedom with such circumspection, that it seemed to be only a war against innovation." "A richly endowed church always leads to Arminianism and justification by works," (p. 503).

"*The American Idea* is thus set forth: "The British Parliament, in its Bill of Rights, had only summed up the liberties that Englishmen in the lapse of centuries had acquired, or had wrested from their kings; the Americans opened their career of independence by a declaration of the self-evident rights of man; and this, begun by Virginia, was repeated, with variations, in every constitution formed after independence, except that of South Carolina." "Here then we have the prevailing idea of political life in the United States. On the one hand, they continued the institutions received from England with as little immediate change as possible; and on the other, they desired for their constitutions a healthy, continuous growth. They accepted the actual state of society as the natural one resulting from the antecedents of the nation; at the same time, they recognized the right of man to make unceasing advances towards realizing political justice, and the public conscience yearned for a nearer approach to ideal perfection." "America neither separated abruptly from the past, nor adhered to its decaying forms. The principles that gave life to the new institutions pervaded history like a prophecy. They did not compel a sudden change of social or of internal political relations; but they were as a light shining more and more brightly into the darkness. In a country which enjoyed freedom of conscience, of inquiry, of speech, of the press, and of government, the universal intuition of truth promised a never-ending career of progress and reform" (p. 233).

The Conversion of the Northern Nations.—The Boyle Lectures, 1865.—By CHARLES MERIVALE, B. D., Author of the "History of the Roman Empire," etc. New York; D. Appleton and Co., 1866, pp. 231. These Lectures are a continuation of a course delivered the previous year upon the "Conversion of the Roman Empire." The first three are devoted mainly to the doctrinal positions of, and the ancient "apologies" for, the Christian Faith. The fourth is entitled "Relapse of Christian Belief and Practice." The last four give a popular and interesting account of the Conversion of the Northern nations, dwelling on their providential preparation for the reception of the Christian faith, and showing the moral and social, as well as the religious changes produced by the Christian system. While none of the views here advanced can claim the merit of originality, they yet serve the purpose of presenting in a broad outline, and in a truly Christian spirit, the main facts of the case. But this course of lectures is by no means equal to that on the "Conversion of the Roman Empire;" it is comparatively slight and immethodical. The style is easy and flowing.

History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.—By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, vols. vii, viii.—*Reign of Elizabeth*, vols. i, ii. New York: Charles Scribner and Co., 1867. In these volumes Mr. Froude begins a new instalment of his remarkable history. The popularity of his work in England is rapidly increasing: it is said that more copies of the late volumes are subscribed for by the great circulating libraries than there were even of Macaulay's History of England. He has made large use of the

despatches of the Spanish ambassadors, which throw much light on the events of the period. The character of Elizabeth is admirably drawn; though he represents her purposes as more vacillating and uncertain than has usually been done. Cecil is justly put forward as the head and front of her policy. The tangled relations of England, both internal and external, are skilfully disentangled, and all the warring elements put in their just relations to each other. The constitution, either of the church or state, as then established, does not meet with Mr. Froude's unqualified endorsement. His sympathies are evidently with the party of progress. Every reader will find in these engrossing volumes, not only entertainment and instruction, but also the materials for revising many traditional, and hitherto unquestioned opinions as to the actors and events of that great transition epoch of England's history.

History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D. Vol. IV. England, Geneva, France, Germany and Italy. New York: Carters, 1866, pp. 491. In the first half of this new instalment of his History, Dr. Merle traverses ground which is more familiar to his English readers than that of most of his previous volumes, narrating the beginnings of the Reformation in England, A.D. 1529 to 1535, under Henry VIII. The latter part of this volume gives a minute account of the contemporary reform movements in Geneva and in Italy. His judgment of its character of Henry VIII in less favorable than that of Froude, having a stricter Christian basis. His conclusions as to the state and temper of the English people are in the main judicious; while his history of the Genevese preparations for Calvin's later work add new materials of great value to the current accounts. The chapter on Francis I. and Melancthon is one of the best.

History of Christianity; from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire.—By HENRY HART MILMAN, Dean of St. Paul's. New edition thoroughly revised and corrected, 3 vols. crown 8vo. New York: W. J. Middleton, 1866. Dean Milman's Histories hold the first rank among similar works on both sides of the water. The *History of the Jews*, in 3 vols., and his *Latin Christianity* are both standard and well known works. His *History of Christianity* has been twenty years before the public, and has received the warm approval of the ablest critics and best judges. This new edition, uniform in size and style with his other histories, contains the last corrections and additions of the venerable author, now nearly four score years of age. This history embraces the important period from the birth of Christ to the abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire, the point at which his *Latin Christianity* begins. The publisher deserves credit for bringing out the work in the best style of the Riverside Press. All these histories are indispensable to every well-furnished library. The clear and popular style of the author adapts them to the general reader, while it by no means lessens their value to the simple student of history.

JURISPRUDENCE.

The Constitutional Convention: its History, Powers, and modes of Proceeding. By JOHN ALEXANDER JAMESON, Judge of the Superior Court of Chicago, etc., New York: Scribner & Co. 1867, pp. 561. This solid work of Judge Jameson is the most important contribution recently made to political philosophy in our country. It is distinguished by its fulness of material, its careful arrangement, and its grasp of principles. The work is di-

vided into eight chapters: 1. The various kinds of Conventions; 2. Of Sovereignty; 3. Of Constitutions; 4. Of the Requisites to the Legitimacy of Conventions, and of their History; 5. The Organization and modes of Proceeding of Conventions; 6. The Power of Conventions; 7. Of the Submission of Constitutions to the people; 8. Of the Amendment of constitutions.

The subject of Sovereignty is fully discussed on the basis of Mr. Austin's general definitions. The note (on p. 19) as to the ground of sovereignty seems to us to allow too much weight to the theory, that it is a development "of natural forces, according to natural laws;" the terms of this theory are, to say the least, quite indefinite, and it may easily be abused. The question about the sovereignty of the United States, as a Nation, is fully and conclusively argued in the affirmative. The recent theory about conventions—that they really have sovereign powers, is ably refuted; the ground taken is, that the members of Conventions are only "delegates," and that they can not enact, but only recommend constitutional and other changes. A full list of all the Conventions thus far held in this country is given in the appendix.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Doctor Johns; being a Narrative of Certain Events in the Life of an Orthodox Minister of Connecticut. By the author of "My Farm at Edgewood." 2 vols. New York: Scribner, 1866. As a work of art this novel will not only sustain, but also increase, the reputation of the author. It is elaborated with great care; the chief characters are sharply portrayed; the scenes and places are drawn with a realistic fidelity. The picture of life in a New England village is brought vividly before the very eye. The freshness of nature, the peculiarities of Connecticut nature, and the household ways, as well as the outdoor doings, of a real Connecticut parish, are depicted as they have not better been in any other work of fiction.

But the very title of the book shows that the author has other than purely æsthetic ends in view. It is intended to represent the legitimate workings and effects of the dominant theology of New England: and it is a sign of a reaction against that form of religion which was there developed on the basis of the old Puritan faith. It is a book with a purpose. Doctor Johns, and his maiden sister Eliza, are the male and female types of New England piety. The Doctor's son, Reuben, shows us how this style of religion affects an impulsive youth, leading him to the very brink of infidelity, until his faith is quickened by influences of a wholly different cast, in part derived from a Roman Catholic devotee. He finds peace only in a broader charity than that in which he has been nurtured. And the bright Adele, the central light of the canvass, clasps her rosary to aid her simple faith. Doctor Johns, too, under her unconscious influence, is brought to the verge of relenting, in feeling, if not in formulas.

Now, an author has an undoubted right to portray a character at his will, to represent his ideal. And such characters as those of the austere Dr. Johns, and the rigid Eliza, were doubtless possible under the New England training. But still they represent only a part of the truth, and that, too, in excess. Serene and lofty faith, disinterestedness, self-denial, humility and impartial love, have also been among the conspicuous fruits of that system of belief, which in these volumes is depicted chiefly in its sterner aspects. One extreme is here given, but the other pole furnishes such instances of faith and charity as no other system has surpassed. What other form of

faith has ever builded such parishes and villages as have been nurtured in our land, chiefly under Puritan auspices? We may indeed imagine a more perfect ideal state of the church and of society; but yet we believe, that this ideal will be sooner realized by a people trained under the main general influences of the Puritan religion and theology, than by a community trained under any system, which lays the most stress upon the external order and the æsthetic influences of the Christian religion.

Notices of the following works are unavoidably postponed :

Ludlow, *Woman's Work in the Church*. Strahan.
 The Queen's English. Strahan.
 The Dean's English. Strahan
 Shanks, *Distinguished Generals*. Harpers.
 Moens, *Italian Brigands*. Harpers.
 Botts, *The Great Rebellion*. Harpers.
 A Chronicle of Secession. Harpers.
 Felix Holt. Harpers.
 Kissing the Rod. Harpers.
 Land at Last. Harpers.
 Madonna Mary. Harpers.
 Fonthill Recreations. Gould and Lincoln.
 Beethoven's Letters. Hurd and Houghton.
 Randolph's Poems. Scribner.
 The Draytons and Davenants. Dodd.
 The Faire Gospeller. Dodd.
 The Lady of La Garaye. Randolph.
 The Higher Education of Women. Strahan.
 Irving's Spanish Papers. Hurd and Houghton.
 South's Sermons. Hurd and Houghton.
 Muehlbach's Frederick the Great. Appletons.
 Bain's English Composition. Appletons.
 Grammatical Analyzer. Appletons.
 Harkness, Latin Book. Appletons.
 Guyot's Geography. Scribner.
 Masson's British Philosophy. Appletons.
 Osgood, American Leaves. Harpers.
 Muehlbach, Bernthal. Harpers.
 Palgrave's Essays on Art. Hurd and Houghton.
 Laboulaye's Fairy Tales. Harpers.

ART. XI.—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

Tischendorf's edition of the Vatican New Testament is promised for the early part of 1867; it will be published in the same form as the Novum Test. Sinaiticum; 1000 copies at 4 Thlr. 20 sgr. In February, March and April, Tischendorf was in Rome, and had special permission to use the Vatican MS. He has corrected the errors in Cardinal Mai's edition, and of the other editions, and will give the MS. for the first time in an authentic form. He distinguishes carefully between the original text of the MS. and

additions made to it in a second hand, and even in a third, several centuries later. The preface will give a history of the MS., an account of its palæographic and other peculiarities, and a discussion of the question of its age. Dr. Tischendorf is also proceeding with his new [the eighth] critical edition of the Greek New Test., of which the first fasciculus was published in 1864, the second in 1865; the third is now in the press. His present critical apparatus is much more complete than that he used in preparing the seventh edition of 1859. *Neue Evang. Kirchenzeitung*.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 4s Hft., 1866. Zahn on Papias of Hierapolis; Hauck on Gal. iii, 20; Bindseil on Luther's Table Talk; a review of Baur's New Test. Theology, by Kostlin, etc. The first part for 1867 has the following articles: Walters, the early history of the Heidelberg Catechism; Romang on Justification by Faith; Hamberger on Baader's Theosophy; Ruet-schi, exegetical notes on Job, etc.

Zeitschrift f. d. historische Theologie, edited by Dr. Kahnis. The first part for 1867 contains Dr. Pressel on Christian William of the Palatinate and the Formula Concordiæ; Dr. Schaff on the oldest editions of the Heidelberg Catechism; E. D. Schnaase on the Bohemian Brethren in Poland and the Reformed in Dantzic.

A biography of Dr. Ullmann, prepared by Prof. Beyschlag, of Halle, has been published as an appendix to the last number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, together with an account by Ullmann himself of his "Part in the Government of the Evangelical Church of Baden," which he left for the *Studien*. These publications are also issued separate from the review.

Von Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift* (Munich, vol. 15, 1866) contains:—Ed. Reimann on the Emperor Maximilian's Religions Development, 1554 to 1564; Von Sybel on Austria and Prussia in the Revolution; Schafer, Count Bruhl and Frederick the Great; F. Kapp, Peter Minnewit of Wesel; Droysen on the Baltic Question; H. v. Holst, Louis XIV and the Huguenots; Schafer, Genuine and Spurious Letters of Frederick the Great and George II, A. D. 1757; G. Voigt on John Jacob Mascov; J. Streiter, the Tyrol War of 1813; with the historical bibliography.

Zeitschrift f. Wissenschaftliche Theologie. Parts 2, 3, 1866. Marbach, The Blood, a Theological Study—exhibiting its relation to sacrifices; Lipsius, the Shepherd of Hermas and Montanism—the third article on it; Buttmann, remarks on the Sinaitic Codex; Pfeiderer, a review of Beyschlag's Christology; Krenkel, notes on some passages in the Minor Prophets; Hilgenfeld, a review of the later works on Paul's Epistles: Spiegel, the Latin poems of John Pollius, a Westphalian poet of the sixteenth century.

FRANCE.

Annales de Philosophie Chretienne. Mai, Juin, Juillet, 1866. Bonnetty on de Saulcy, Travels in the Holy Land; Desbassins de Richemont on de Rossi's *Roma Sotteronea Cristiana*; Abbe Inchaupse on M. de Charency's Basque language and idioms; Bonnetty on the religion of the Romans in relation to the bible; Alexandre on the rehabilitation of paganism in the fifteenth century, a preliminary account of Plethon and his treatise on the laws; de Rossi's discovery at Pompeii of the title of Pomponius Lethus as the reigning sovereign Pontiff, by Bonnetty; Fialon on St. Basil, noticed by Abbe Gainet, etc. The article by M. Alexandre, of the Institute, on Plethon, is able and

interesting; he gives a much less favorable view of Plethon's relations to Christianity than previous writers have done.

Revue Chretienne. July to November. L. Rognon on Guizot's *Meditations* on the present state of christianity; Prof. Godet on Pressense's life of Jesus; Pelet de la Lozere, the Reformed Church of France in its Relations to the State; Peter, the state of piety in the midst of French Protestantism; Pressense, the lessons of the French Revolution, including a review of Quinet's recent work on that subject; E. Bersier, on Godet's commentary on the Gospel of John; R. Holland, Manuel Matamoros. E. de Guerle reviews Astie's recent history of the United States in highly laudatory terms: he says, "Carver, Miles Standish, Roger Williams, will in the future be great among the great, and if liberty is destined to triumph here below, the rock of Plymouth will be as famous as the Seven Hills of Rome." Pedezert has a good criticism, in the November number, on the 3rd part of the Duke de Broglie's work on Christianity in the fourth century, Valentinian and Theodosius.

In the *Revue des deux Mondes*, Aug. 15, M. Littré replies to Mill's strictures on Comte's system. Among other things he takes Mr. Mill to task for saying that the principles of positivism are not at war with a belief in the existence of God. Mill, says Littré, has here made too much of a concession to English prejudices. Positivism must say, that the existence of God cannot be proved; nothing can be proved which is not a scientific induction from observed facts.

M. Bonifas has been elected professor of church history in Montauban, by a large majority of the Synods; he is still young, but is known by his treatises on Schleiermacher and Leibnitz, and by a recent *essai sur l'unité de l'enseignement apostolique*, dedicated to Dorner of Berlin. In the *Revue Chretienne* for Nov., there is an excellent article by him on the idea of God and Christianity, based on Naville's admirable discourses on the heavenly Father.

An important discovery of manuscripts is thus heralded by the Paris *Moniteur*:—"The town of Edcemiadzin, near Mount Ararat, in Armenia, the residence of the patriarch, contains a splendid library, composed of three thousand Armenian manuscripts of which the literary world was hitherto quite ignorant. A catalogue of the collection has now been printed, and presents a vast field for researches into the religious and political history of Central Asia. It reveals the existence of unknown works by the fathers of the church, and of fragments of Diodorus Siculus, and of Aristotle. The Armenian Patriarch states in an official preface, that those manuscripts which have been kept secret will be for the future not only open to examination, but that extracts may be taken for learned men in all parts of the world if they pay the cost of copying."

ENGLAND.

The Journal of Sacred Literature. Oct.—Alternative Versions of the Psalms; Hermes Trismegistus, by Prof. Masson; The abuse of Criticism in Religion, by D'Alembert; Dr. Rowland Williams on the Prophets; Exegesis of difficult Texts; Pantheism, by W. H. Gillespie; Limitation of Inspiration; The True Character of Mary of Magdala, by Rev. J. E. Prescott—denying her identity with "the sinner who washed the feet of our Lord," Luke vii, 36; Eusebius of Cesarea, on the Star, by Dr. W. Wright; Obituary, J. M. Neale; Correspondence; Reviews, etc.

is ;
g
n,
I.

Hours at Home.

The November number begins the *fourth* volume of HOURS AT HOME. The aim of its conductors is to produce a FAMILY MAGAZINE of such varied interest and possessing such high literary and moral worth as shall secure for it the confidence of the wise and good, and gain for it in time a welcome entrance into all our Christian households. Our purpose is not to make HOURS AT HOME a formally Religious Monthly, but to give it a high moral and religious tone throughout, and to discuss every subject which comes within its scope from the Christian standpoint. Our single and resolute aim is to establish a magazine equal to any in the country in the variety of its contents and in general literary ability; one which shall help to educate the moral and religious nature of man, to elevate his tastes, and conduce to social purity and domestic virtue. Hitherto our success has been all that could reasonably have been anticipated, and yet not all that is desirable. From every quarter we receive assurances that HOURS AT HOME is appreciated, and we are encouraged to go forward, not doubting that a large success will ultimately crown the enterprise.

In such an endeavor the publishers feel that they have a claim upon the Christian Ministry, Christian Parents, Young Men's Christian Associations, Sunday-School Teachers, and all indeed who prefer a pure, healthful, and instructive literature to one that is sensational, enervating, and corrupting.

We have been aided by the pens of more than two hundred writers, many of them among the most distinguished of the day, and we are all the while enlisting others.

Premiums for Hours at Home.

For **Twenty Subscribers (\$60)** we will give one of

WHEELER & WILSON'S SEWING-MACHINES,

The cash price of which is \$55.

We regard WHEELER & WILSON'S as the Best Family Sewing-Machine in use. We have furnished a large number of them as premiums, and in every instance we believe they have given perfect satisfaction. By a little effort a Club of twenty can be raised in almost any place, and pure and useful reading thereby secured to as many families for a year, and in addition this now indispensable help to the family. If you yourself do not need it, get it for your Minister's Family, or for some poor widow who is dependent on her needle.

LANGE'S COMMENTARY.

Three Volumes.

For **Fifteen Subscribers, (\$45)** the three volumes of this great Commentary, post-paid; for **Five Subscribers, (\$15)** either volume.

DR. OWEN'S COMMENTARIES.

Three Volumes.

For **Five Subscribers, (\$15)** the three volumes of this Standard Commentary on the Gospels, post-paid.

GET UP YOUR CLUBS FOR ANOTHER YEAR.

Now is the time to form a Club in every town and in every parish. Will not the friends of pure literature exert themselves to extend in this way the circulation of HOURS AT HOME?

TERMS: \$3 a year; Single numbers, 30 cents; Six copies for \$15; Twelve copies for \$30, and one free to the one who gets up the Club. Clergymen and Students of Theology receive it for \$2.50.

BOUND VOLUMES: The first three volumes are elegantly bound and will be sent post-paid for \$2.50 each or the *three* for \$7. For \$9, the three volumes and a year's subscription. For \$5, either volume and a year's subscription.

PREMIUMS: For \$9, three subscriptions for a year and either bound volume. For \$18, six subscriptions for a year and either 1st, 2d, or 3d vol. of *LANGE'S COMMENTARY*. For **TWENTY SUBSCRIPTIONS, (\$60),** a *Wheeler & Wilson Sewing-Machine*, now sold at \$55 cash.

Subscriptions may begin with any number. Back numbers can always be supplied.

The postage on HOURS AT HOME is two cents a number.

Persons wishing to discontinue the work will please give early notice. The work will continue to be sent as first ordered until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address.

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.

The American

PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW,

For 1867.

The Presbyterian Quarterly Review, published in Philadelphia from 1852, and *The American Theological Review*, published in New York from 1859, were united in January, 1863, under the title: *The American Presbyterian and Theological Review*. Its present editor is Professor Henry B. Smith, of the Union Theological Seminary, and Rev. J. M. Sherwood, aided by Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, and Professors K. D. Hitchcock, and J. B. Condit.

This *Review* was recommended by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, 1863, in the following terms:

"Being under the editorial control of several of the most distinguished ministers in our connection, representing various sections and institutions, and in the full confidence, from the numbers already issued, the pledges given, and the talent enlisted in it, that it will be true to the principles and ably serve the cause of our denomination, this General Assembly takes pleasure in commending it to the patronage of our ministers and churches."

It has also been cordially recommended by the journals of our own and other denominations, and by many literary periodicals:

"*Trulmer's American and Oriental Literary Record*, (London), speaks of it "as one of the ablest orthodox reviews which reaches us. In addition to a large number of valuable original articles on important subjects, it contains many terse and vigorous criticisms on new books, while its literary intelligence is more valuable than that of any journal we know." *The New York Times*: "It is supported by some of the ablest theological writers in the country. The articles are weighty, solid, and well considered." *The Christian Intelligencer*, (New York), says it is "one of the ablest quarterlies published in this country." *The Congregationalist*, (Boston), says "that the October number has as usual a rich and varied table of contents." *The Evangelist*: "It contains a series of articles from some of the ablest writers of our church, and should be in the hands not only of all our pastors, but of our intelligent laymen."

No *Review* in the country has a better corps of contributors. Among them, besides the editors and associate editors, are Drs. Skinner, Shedd, Schaff, Wm. Adams, Prentiss, Gillett and Hatfield, of New York; President Hickok and Prof. Tayler Lewis, of Union College; with professors in various colleges, and well known divines and laymen in several denominations. Translations of important essays by German and French writers are published in every volume. While the *Review* represents the principles of the Presbyterian Church, it devotes a large space to topics of general interest in Theology and Philosophy, and to theological and literary intelligence.

With the number for January, 1867, this *Review* begins the fifth volume of the New Series. The price is not advanced, though the expense of publishing has been nearly doubled. It can be well maintained only by increasing the number of its subscribers. Being the only quarterly issued in our branch of the Presbyterian Church, its conductors appeal with confidence to our ministers and laymen to aid them in their work. Will not some of our laymen see to it, that it is sent to all our Home and Foreign Missionaries? It will be furnished to them at the cost price of \$2.50.

The *Review* is issued quarterly in New York and Philadelphia.

TERMS—\$3.00, strictly in advance; \$3.50 within three months, or when received through agents; \$4.00 at the end of the year; \$2.50 for Missionaries and Theological Students, when paid in advance.

The back volumes bound, and in numbers, for sale.

Address, WM. SHERWOOD,

(Care C. SCRIBNER & Co.,)

654 Broadway, New York.